arXiv:1603.03218v2 [math.PR] 9 May 2016

Multi-Particle Diffusion Limited Aggregation

Vladas Sidoravicius* and Alexandre Stauffer†

Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York
NYU-ECNU Institute of Mathematical Sciences at NYU Shanghai
CEMADEN, São José dos Campos
and
University of Bath

Abstract

We consider a stochastic aggregation model on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, $d \geq 1$. Start with an infinite collection of particles located at the vertices of the lattice, with at most one particle per vertex, and initially distributed according to the product Bernoulli measure with parameter $\mu \in (0,1)$. In addition, there is an aggregate, which initially consists of only one particle placed at the origin. Non-aggregated particles move as continuous time simple symmetric random walks obeying the exclusion rule, whereas aggregated particles do not move. The aggregate grows indefinitely by attaching particles to its surface whenever a particle attempts to jump onto it. This evolution will be referred to as *multi-particle diffusion limited aggregation* (MDLA).

Our main result states that if on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, $d \geq 2$, the initial density of particles $\mu \in (0,1)$ is large enough, then with positive probability the aggregate has linearly growing arms, *i.e.* if we denote by $F(t)$ the point of the aggregate that is furthest away from the origin at time $t > 0$, then there exists a constant $c = c(\mu, d) > 0$, such that $|F(t)| \geq ct$, for all t eventually.

The key conceptual element and the major technical step of our analysis is the introduction and study of a *new growth process*. The analysis of its evolution provides an important tool to obtain a lower bound for the growth rate of MDLA. More precisely, we consider a first passage percolation process, called type 1, starting from the origin. Whenever the type 1 process is about to occupy a new vertex, with positive probability, instead of doing it, it gives rise to another first passage percolation process, called type 2, which starts to spread from that vertex. Each vertex gets occupied only by the process that arrives to it first, causing type 1 and type 2 to block each other's evolution. This growth process may have three phases: *an extinction phase*, where type 1 gets eventually surrounded by type 2 clusters and stop evolving, *a coexistence phase*, where infinite clusters of both types emerge, and *a strong survival phase*, where type 1 produces an infinite cluster that successfully surrounds all encountered type 2 clusters. Understanding the behavior of this process in its various phases is of mathematical interest on its own right. We establish the existence of a strong survival phase, and use this to show our main result.

*Supported in part by CNPq grants 308787/2011-0 and 476756/2012-0 and FAPERJ grant E-26/102.878/2012-BBP.

†Supported by a Marie Curie Career Integration Grant PCIG13-GA-2013-618588 DSRELIS, and an EPSRC Early Career Fellowship.

1 Introduction

In this work we consider one of the classical aggregation processes, introduced in [20] (see also [22]) with the goal of providing an example of "a simple and tractable" mathematical model of dendritic growth, for which theoretical and mathematical concepts and tools could be designed and tested on. Almost four decades later we still encounter tremendous mathematical challenges studying its geometric and dynamic properties, and understanding the driving mechanism lying behind the formation of fractal-like structures.

Multi-particle diffusion limited aggregation (MDLA). We consider the following stochastic aggregation model on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, $d \geq 1$. Start with an infinite collection of particles located at the vertices of the lattice, with at most one particle per vertex, and initially distributed according to the product Bernoulli measure with parameter $\mu \in (0, 1)$. In addition, there is an aggregate, which initially consists of only one special particle, placed at the origin. The system evolves in continuous time. Non-aggregated particles move as simple symmetric random walks obeying the exclusion rule, i.e. particles jump at rate 1 to a uniformly random neighbor, but if the chosen neighbor already contains another non-aggregated particle, such jump is suppressed and the particle waits for the next attempt to jump. Aggregated particles do not move. Whenever a non-aggregated particle attempts to jump on a vertex occupied by the aggregate, the jump of this particle is suppressed, the particle becomes part of the aggregate, and never moves from that moment onwards. Thus the aggregate grows by attaching particles to its surface whenever a particle attempts to jump onto it. This evolution will be referred to as *multi-particle diffusion limited aggregation* MDLA; examples for different values of μ are shown in Figure 1.



Figure 1: MDLA with $\mu = 0.1$ and 0.3, respectively. Colors represent different epochs of the evolution of the process.

Characterizing the behavior of MDLA is a widely open and challenging problem. Existing mathematical results are limited to one dimension [17, 6]. In this case, it is known that the aggregate has almost surely *sublinear* growth for any $\mu \in (0, 1)$, having size of order $\sqrt{t}$ by time t. The main obstacle preventing the aggregate to grow with positive speed is that, from the point of view of the front (i.e., the rightmost point) of the aggregate, the density of particles decreases since the

aggregate grows by forming a region of density 1, larger than the initial density of particles.

In dimensions two and higher, MDLA seems to present a much richer and complex behavior, which changes substantially depending on the value of μ; refer to Figure 1. For small values of μ, the low density of particles affects the rate of growth of the aggregate, as it needs to wait particles that move diffusively to find their way to its boundary. This suggests that the growth of the aggregate at small scales is governed by evolution of the "local" harmonic measure of its boundary. This causes the aggregate to grow by protruding long fractal-like arms, similar to dendrites. On the other hand, when μ is large enough, the situation appears to be different. In this case, the aggregate is immersed in a very dense cloud of particles, and its growth follows random, dynamically evolving geodesics that deviate from occasional regions without particles. Instead of showing dendritic type of growth, the aggregate forms a dense region characterized by the appearance of a limiting shape, similar to a first passage percolation process [19]. These two regimes do not seem to be exclusive. For intermediate values of μ, the process shows the appearance of a limiting shape at macroscopic scales, while zooming in to mesoscopic and microscopic scales reveals rather complex ramified structures similar to dendritic growth, as in Figure 2.



Figure 2: MDLA with $\mu = 0.2$, showing a limiting shape at macroscopic scales, but rather complex ramified structures at mesoscopic and microscopic scales.

The main result of this paper is to establish that, unlike in dimension one, in dimensions $d \geq 2$

MDLA has a phase of *linear* growth. We actually prove a stronger result, showing that the aggregate grows with positive speed in *all* directions. For $t \geq 0$, let $\mathcal{A}_t \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ be the set of vertices occupied by the aggregate by time t, and let $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_t \supseteq \mathcal{A}_t$ be the set of vertices of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ that are not contained in the infinite component of $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \mathcal{A}_t$. Note that $\bar{\mathcal{A}}_t$ comprises all vertices of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ that either belong to the aggregate or are separated from infinity by the aggregate. For $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we denote by $B(x, r)$ the ball of radius r centered at x.

Theorem 1.1. *There exists $\mu_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that, for all $\mu > \mu_0$, there are positive constants $c_1 = c_1(\mu, d)$ and $c_2 = c_2(\mu, d)$ for which*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bar{\mathcal{A}}_t \supset B(0, c_1 t) \text{ for all } t \geq 0\right) > c_2.$$

We believe that the above theorem holds in a stronger form, with $\mathbb{P}\left(\bar{\mathcal{A}}_t \supset B(0, c_1 t) \text{ for all } t \geq t_0\right)$ going to 1 with t_0. However, with positive probability, it happens that there is no particle within a large distance to the origin at time 0. In this case, in the initial stages of the process, the aggregate will grow very slowly as if in a system with a small density of particles. We expect that the density of particles near the boundary of the aggregate will become close to μ after particles have moved for a large enough time, allowing the aggregate to start having positive speed of growth. However, particles perform a non-equilibrium dynamics due to their interaction with the aggregate, and the behavior and the effect of this initial stage of low density is not yet understood mathematically. This is related to the problem of describing the behavior of MDLA for small values of μ, which is still far from reach, and raises the challenging question of whether the aggregate has positive speed of growth for any $\mu > 0$. Even in a heuristic level, it is not at all clear what the behavior of the aggregate should be for small μ. On the one hand, the low density of particles causes the aggregate to grow slowly since particles move diffusively until they are aggregated. On the other hand, since the aggregate is immersed in a dense cloud of particles, this effect of slow growth could be restricted to small scales only, because at very large scales the aggregate could simultaneously grow in many different directions.

We now describe the ideas of the proof of Theorem 1.1. For this we use the language of the dual representation of the exclusion process, where vertices without particles are regarded as hosting another type of particles, called *holes*, which perform among themselves simple symmetric random walks obeying the exclusion rule. When μ is large enough, at the initial stages of the process, the aggregate grows without encountering any hole. The growth of the aggregate is then equivalent to a first passage percolation process with independent exponential passage times. This stage is well understood: it is known that first passage percolation not only grows with positive speed, but also has a limiting shape [19]. However, at some moment, the aggregate will start encountering holes. We can regard the aggregate as a solid wall for holes, as they can neither jump onto the aggregate nor be attached to the aggregate. In one dimension, holes end up accummulating at the boundary of the aggregate, and this is enough to prevent positive speed of growth. The situation is different in dimensions $d \geq 2$, since the aggregate is able to deviate from any hole it encounters, advancing through the particles that lie in the neighborhood of the hole until it completely surrounds and entraps the hole. The problem is that the aggregate will find regions of holes of arbitrarily large sizes, which require a long time for the aggregate to go around them. When μ is large enough, the regions of holes will be typically well spaced out, giving sufficient room for the aggregate to grow in-between the holes. One needs to show that the delays caused by deviation from holes are not large enough to prevent positive speed. A challenge is that as holes cannot jump onto the aggregate, their motion gets a drift whenever they are neighboring the aggregate. Hence, holes move according to a non-equilibrium dynamics, which creates difficulties in controlling the location



Figure 3: FPPHE with $\lambda = 0.7$ and $p = 0.030, 0.029$ and 0.027, respectively. Colors represent different epochs of the growth of η^1, while the thin curve at the boundary represents the boundary between η^2 and unoccupied vertices. The whole white region within this boundary is occupied by η^2.

of the holes. In order to overcome this problem, we introduce a new process to model the interplay between the aggregate and holes.

First passage percolation in a hostile environment (FPPHE). This is a two-type first passage percolation process. At any time $t \geq 0$, let $\eta^1(t)$ and $\eta^2(t)$ denote the vertices of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ occupied by type 1 and type 2, respectively. We start with $\eta^1(0)$ containing only the origin of $\mathbb{Z}^d$, and $\eta^2(0)$ being a random set obtained by selecting each vertex of $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ with probability $p \in (0,1)$, independently of one another. Both type 1 and type 2 are growing processes; i.e., for any times $t < t'$ we have $\eta^1(t) \subseteq \eta^1(t')$ and $\eta^2(t) \subseteq \eta^2(t')$. Type 1 spreads from time 0 throughout $\mathbb{Z}^d$ at rate 1. Type 2 does not spread at first, and we denote $\eta^2(0)$ as *type 2 seeds*. Whenever the type 1 process attempts to occupy a vertex hosting a type 2 seed, the occupation is suppressed and that type 2 seed is *activated* and starts to spread throughout $\mathbb{Z}^d$ at rate $\lambda \in (0,1)$. The other type 2 seeds remain inactive until type 1 attempts to occupy their location. A vertex of the lattice is only occupied by the type that arrives to it first, so $\eta^1(t)$ and $\eta^2(t)$ are disjoint sets for all t; this causes the two types to compete with each other for space. Note that type 2 spreads with smaller rate than type 1, but type 2 starts with a density of seeds while type 1 starts only from a single location.

We show that it is possible to couple this process with MDLA so that, at any given time t, every hole that has been in contact with the aggregate by time t is contained inside $\eta^2(t)$, and the aggregate at time t contains $\eta^1(t)$. Hence, establishing that the type 1 process grows with positive speed implies that MDLA has linear growth. Besides its application to studying MDLA, we believe that FPPHE is an interesting process to analyze on its own right, as it shows fascinating different phases of behavior depending on the choice of p and λ. An illustration of the behavior of this process is shown in Figure 3.

The first phase is the *extinction phase*, where type 1 stops growing in finite time with probability 1. This occurs, for example, when $p > 1 - p_c$, with $p_c = p_c(d)$ being the critical probability for independent site percolation on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. In this case, with probability 1, the origin is contained in a finite cluster of vertices not occupied by type 2 seeds, and hence type 1 will eventually stop growing. This extinction phase for type 1 also arises when $p \leq 1 - p_c$ but λ is large enough so that type 2 clusters grow quickly enough to surround type 1 and confine it to a finite set. We show in this work that another phase exists, called the *strong survival phase*, and which is characterized by a positive probability of appearance of an infinite cluster of type 1, while type 2 is confined to form

only finite clusters. Note that type 1 cannot form an infinite cluster with probability 1, since with positive probability all neighbors of the origin contain seeds of type 2. Unlike the extinction phase, whose existence is quite trivial to show, the existence of a strong survival phase for some value of p and λ is far from obvious. Here we not only establish the existence of this phase, but we show that such a phase exists for *any* $\lambda < 1$ provided p is small enough, and that type 1 has positive speed of growth. For any t, we define $\bar{\eta}^1(t)$ as the set of vertices of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ that are not contained in the infinite component of $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \eta^1(t)$, which comprises $\eta^1(t)$ and all vertices of $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \eta^1(t)$ that are separated from infinity by $\eta^1(t)$.

Theorem 1.2. *For any $\lambda < 1$, there exists a value $p_0 \in (0,1)$ such that, for all $p \in (0, p_0)$, there are positive constants $c_1 = c_1(p,d)$ and $c_2 = c_2(p,d)$ for which*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\eta^1(t) \supseteq B(0, c_1 t) \text{ for all } t \geq 0\right) > c_2.$$

There is a third possible regime, which we call the *coexistence phase* and is characterized by type 1 and type 2 simultaneously forming infinite clusters with positive probability. Whether this regime actually occurs for some value of p and λ is an open problem, and even simulations do not seem to give good evidence of the existence of this regime. For example, in the rightmost picture of Figure 3, we observe a regime where η^1 survives, while η^2 seems to produce only finite clusters, but of quite long sizes. This also seems to be the behavior of the central picture in Figure 3, though it is not as clear whether each cluster of η^2 will be eventually confined to a finite set. However, the behavior in the leftmost picture of Figure 3 is not at all clear. The cluster of η^1 has survived until the simulation was stopped, but produced a very thin set. It is not clear whether coexistence will happen in this situation, whether η^1 will eventually stop growing, or even whether after a much longer time the "arms" produced by η^1 will eventually find one another, constraining η^2 to produce only finite clusters.

Establishing whether a coexistence phase exists for some value of p and λ is an interesting open problem. We can establish that a coexistence phase occurs in a particular example of FPPHE, where type 1 and type 2 have deterministic passage times, with all randomness coming from the locations of the seeds. In this example, all three phases occur. We discuss this in Section 2.

Historical remarks and related works. MDLA belongs to a class of models, introduced firstly in the physics and chemistry literature (see [12] and references therein), and later in the mathematics literature as well, with the goal of studying geometric and dynamic properties of static formations produced by aggregating randomly moving colloidal particles. Some numerically established quantities, such as fractal dimension, showed striking similarities between clusters produced by aggregating particles and clusters produced in other growth processes of entirely different nature, such as dielectric breakdown cascades and Laplacian growth models (in particular, Hele-Shaw cell [21]). These similarities were further investigated by the introduction of the Hastings-Levitov growth model [10], which is represented as a sequence of conformal mappings. Nonetheless, it is still debated in the physics literature whether some of these models belong to the same universality class or not [3].

In the mathematics literature, the diffusion limited aggregation model (DLA), introduced in [11] following the introduction of MDLA in [20], became a paradigm object of study among aggregation models driven by diffusive particles. However, progress on understanding DLA and MDLA mathematically has been relatively modest. The main results known about DLA are bounds on its rate of growth, derived by Kesten [13, 14] (see also [1]), but several variants have been introduced and studied [2, 4, 8, 18, 5]. Regarding MDLA, it was rigorously studied only in the one-dimensional case [6, 17, 16], for which sublinear growth has been proved for all densities $p \in (0,1)$ in [17].

Structure of the paper. We start in Section 2 with a discussion of an example of FPPHE where the passage times are deterministic, and show that this process has a coexistence phase. Then, in preparation for the proof of strong survival of FPPHE (Theorem 1.2), we state in Section 3 existing results on first passage percolation, and discuss in Section 4 a result due to Häggstrom and Pemantle regarding non-coexistence of a two-type first passage percolation process. This result plays a fundamental role in our analysis of FPPHE. Then we give the proof of Theorem 1.2 in Section 5. In Section 6 we relate FPPHE with MDLA, giving the proof of Theorem 1.1.

2 Example of coexistence in FPPHE

In this section we consider FPPHE with *deterministic* passage times. That is, whenever type 1 (resp., type 2) occupies a vertex $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, then after time 1 (resp., $1/\lambda$) type 1 (resp., type 2) will occupy all unoccupied neighbors of x. If both type 1 and type 2 try to occupy a vertex at the same time, we choose one of them uniformly at random. Recall that we denote by $\eta^i(t)$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$, the set of vertices occupied by type i by time t. For simplicity, we restrict this discussion to dimension $d = 2$.



Figure 4: Simulation of FPPHE with deterministic passage times, and parameters $p = 0.2$ and $\lambda = 0.9, 0.8$ and 0.7, respectively. Black vertices are occupied by η^1 and yellow vertices are occupied by η^2.

Figure 4 shows a simulation of this process for $p = 0.2$ and different values of λ. In all the three pictures in Figure 4, η^1 seems to survive. However, note that the leftmost picture in Figure 4 differs from the other two since η^2 also seems to give rise to an infinite cluster, characterizing a regime of coexistence. See Figure 5 for more details.

Our theorem below establishes the existence of a coexistence phase. We note that here the phase for survival for η^1 is stronger than that shown in Theorem 1.2. Here we show that for some small enough p, η^1 survives for *any* $\lambda < 1$. The actual value of λ plays a role only on determining whether coexistence happens. In the theorem below and its proof, a directed path in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ is defined to be a path whose jumps are only along the *positive* direction of the coordinates.

Theorem 2.1. *For any $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and any $p \in (0, 1 - p_c^{\mathrm{dir}})$, where $p_c^{\mathrm{dir}} = p_c^{\mathrm{dir}}(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ denotes the critical probability for* directed *site percolation in $\mathbb{Z}^d$, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\eta^1 \text{ produces an infinite cluster}\right) > 0. \tag{1}$$



Figure 5: Detailed view of Figure 4 for $p = 0.2$ and $\lambda = 0.9$ and 0.8, respectively.

Furthermore, for any $\lambda \in (0,1)$, there exists a positive $p_0 < 1-p_c^{\mathrm{dir}}$ such that for any $p \in (p_0, 1-p_c^{\mathrm{dir}})$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\eta^1 \text{ and } \eta^2 \text{ both produce infinite clusters}\right) > 0. \tag{2}$$

Proof. Consider a directed percolation process on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ where a vertex is declared to be open if it is not in $\eta^2(0)$, otherwise the vertex is closed. For any $t \geq 0$, let C_t be the vertices reachable from the origin by a directed path of length at most t where all vertices in the path are open. We will prove (1) by showing that

$$\eta^1(t) \supseteq C_t \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \tag{3}$$

Let $x \in \eta^2(0)$ be the vertex of $\eta^2(0)$ that is the closest to the origin, in ℓ_1 norm. Clearly, for any time $t < \|x\|_1$, we have that $\eta^1(t)$ has not yet interacted with $\eta^2(0)$, giving that $\eta^1(t) = \{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \colon \|y\|_1 \leq t\} = C_t$. See Figure 6(a) for an illustration. Then, at time $\|x\|_1$, η^1 tries to occupy all vertices at distance $\|x\|_1$ from the origin, leading to the configuration in Figure 6(b) and activating the seed x of $\eta^2(0)$, illustrated in pink in the picture. Since η^1 is faster than η^2, η^1 is able to "go around" x, traversing the same path as in a directed percolation process. This leads to the configuration in 6(c). Note that the same behavior occurs when η^1 finds a larger set of consecutive seeds of η^2 at the same ℓ_1 distance from the origin. For example, see what happens with the three red seeds in Figure 6(d–f). In this case, a directed percolation process does not reach any vertex inside the red triangle in Figure 6(f), as those vertices are shaded by the three red seeds. Since η^2 is slower than η^1, the cluster of η^2 that starts to grow when the three red seeds are activated cannot occupy any vertex outside of the red triangle.

A different situation occurs when η^1 finds a vertex of $\eta^2(0)$ in the axis, as with the yellow vertex of Figure 6(c). Note that, in a directed percolation process, all vertices below the yellow seed will not be reachable from the origin. In our two-type process, something similar occurs, but only for a finite number of steps. When η^1 activates the yellow seed at $x \in \eta^2(0)$, η^1 cannot immediately go around x as explained above. For λ close enough to 1, η^2 occupies the successive vertex in the axis before η^1 can go around x. This continues for some steps, with η^2 being able to grow along the axis; see Figure 6(d,e). However, at each step η^1 will be $1-\lambda$ faster than η^2. This will accumulate for roughly $\frac{1}{1-\lambda}$ steps, when η^1 will finally be able to go around η^2; as in Figure 6(f). This happens unless $\eta^2(0)$ happens to have a seed at a vertex neighboring one of the vertices on the axis occupied by the growth of η^2. This is illustrated by the green vertices of Figure 6(f–h).



Figure 6: Evolution of FPPHE with deterministic passage times and $\lambda = 0.59$. Black vertices represent η^1 and white vertices represent unocuppied vertices. All other colors represent clusters of η^2.

When the first green vertex out of the axis is activated, η^1 will not be able to occupy the vertex to the right of the green vertex, and will encounter the next green seed before it can go around the first green seed found at the axis. The crucial fact to observe is that the clusters of η^2 that start to grow after the activation of each green seed can only occupy vertices located to the right of the seeds, and at the same vertical coordinate. This is a subset of the vertices that are shaded by the green seeds in a directed percolation process. Therefore, (1) follows since the vertices occupied by η^2 are a subset of the following set: take the union of all triangles obtained from sets of consecutive seeds away from the axis (as with the pink, red and blue seeds in Figure 6), and take the union of semi-lines starting at seeds located at the axis or at seeds neighboring semi-lines starting from seeds of smaller ℓ_1 distance to the origin (as with the yellow and green seeds in Figure 6). This set is exactly the set of vertices not reached by a directed path from the origin.

Now we turn to (2). First notice that, from the first part, we have that $\eta^1(t) \supseteq C_t$ for all p and λ. Since C_t does not depend on λ, once we fix $p \in (0, 1 - p_c^{\text{dir}})$, we can take λ as close to 1 as we want, and η^1 will still produce an infinite component. Now we consider one of the axis. For example, the one containing the green vertices in Figure 6. Let $(x, 0)$ be the first vertex occupied by η^2 in that axis. For each integer k, we will define X_k as the smallest non-negative integer such that (k, X_k) will be occupied by η^1. Similarly, Y_k is the smallest non-negative integer such that $(k, -Y_k)$ will be occupied by η^1. Now we analyze the evolution of X_k; the one of Y_k will be analogous. Assume that $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_{k-1} = 0$. Then, with probability at least p we have that $X_{k+1} \geq 1$. When this happens, η^1 will need to do at least $\frac{1}{1-\lambda}$ steps before being able to occupy the axis again. However, for each $s \geq 2$, the probability that $X_{k+s} > X_{k+1}$ is at least p. This gives that the probability that the random variable X reaches value above 1 before going back to zero is at least $1 - (1-p)^{\frac{1}{1-\lambda}}$. Once we have fixed p, by setting λ close enough to 1 we can make this probability very close to 1. This gives that X_k has a drift upwards. Since the downwards jumps of X_k are of size at most 1,

this implies that at some time X_k will depart from 0 and will never return to it. A similar behavior happens for Y_k, establishing (2). □

3 Preliminaries on first passage percolation

Consider a first passage percolation process $\{\xi(t)\}_t$, which starts from the origin and spreads throughout $\mathbb{Z}^d$ at rate 1. More precisely, for each pair of neighboring vertices $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, let $\zeta_{x,y}$ be an independent exponential random variable of rate 1. The value $\zeta_{x,y}$ is regarded as the time that ξ needs to spread throughout the edge (x, y). Note that ζ defines a random metric on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Hence, given any initial configuration $\xi(0) \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, the set $\xi(t)$ comprises all vertices of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ that are within distance t from $\xi(0)$ according to the metric ζ. We assume throughout the paper that $d \geq 2$.

For $X \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, let $\mathbb{Q}_X$ be the probability measure induced by the process ξ when $\xi(0) = X$. (When the value of $\xi(0)$ is not important, we will simply write $\mathbb{Q}$.) Let $\tilde{\xi}(t) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be defined by $\tilde{\xi}(t) = \bigcup_{x\in\xi(t)} \left(x + [-1/2, 1/2]^d\right)$; that is, $\tilde{\xi}(t)$ is obtained by adding a unit cube centered at each point of $\xi(t)$. A celebrated theorem of Richardson [19] establishes that the rescaled set $\frac{\tilde{\xi}(t)}{t}$ converges as $t \to \infty$ to a deterministic set, which we denote by $\mathcal{B}$. See [7] for an extension to other distributions of passage times. Such a result is now widely referred to as a *shape theorem*. The set $\mathcal{B}$ defines a norm $|\cdot|$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ via

$$|x| = \inf\left\{r \in \mathbb{R}_+ \colon x \in r\mathcal{B}\right\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

We abuse notation and define, for any $t \geq 0$, $\mathcal{B}(t)$ as the ball of radius t according to the norm above: $\mathcal{B}(t) = \left\{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \colon |x| \leq t\right\}$.

In [15, Theorem 2], Kesten derived upper bounds on the fluctuations of $\xi(t)$ around $\mathcal{B}(t)$. We state Kesten's result in Proposition 3.1 below, in a form that is more suitable to our use later. Before, we need to introduce some notation. Given any set of positive values $\{\zeta'_{x,y}\}_{x,y}$ to the edges of the lattice, which we from now on refer to as *passage times* and view it as a metric, and given any two vertices $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, let

$$D(x, y; \zeta') \text{ be the distance between } x \text{ and } y \text{ according to the metric } \zeta'. \tag{4}$$

We extend this notion to subsets by writing

$$D(X, Y; \zeta') = \inf_{x\in X, y\in Y} D(x, y; \zeta'), \quad \text{for any } X, Y \subset \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

For two vertices $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we use the notation

$$x \sim y \text{ if } x \text{ and } y \text{ are neighbors in } \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

Furthermore, for any set $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, define

$$\text{the } \textit{inner boundary} \text{ of } A \text{ by } \partial^{\mathrm{i}}A = \{x \in A \colon \exists y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus A \text{ and } x \sim y\},$$
$$\text{the } \textit{outer boundary} \text{ of } A \text{ by } \partial^{\mathrm{o}}A = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus A \colon \exists y \in A \text{ and } x \sim y\},$$
$$\text{and the } \textit{edge boundary} \text{ of } A \text{ by } \partial^{\mathrm{e}}A = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{Z}^d, x \sim y \colon x \in A \text{ and } y \notin A\}.$$

Given a set $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, we say that an event is measurable with respect to passage times inside A if the event is measurable with respect to the passage times of the edges whose both endpoints are in A.

Proposition 3.1. *For any $t > 0$, any $\delta \in (0,1)$, and any set of passage times ζ', define the event*

$$S_t^\delta(\zeta') = \left\{ \inf_{x \in \partial^{\mathrm{i}} \mathcal{B}((1+\delta)t)} D(0,x;\zeta') \le t \right\} \cup \left\{ \sup_{x \in \partial^{\mathrm{o}} \mathcal{B}((1-\delta)t)} D(0,x;\zeta') \ge t \right\}.$$

Disregarding some discrepancies in the choice of the boundary, $S_t^\delta(\zeta')$ is the event that $\xi(t)$ is either not contained in $\mathcal{B}((1+\delta)t)$ or does not contain $\mathcal{B}((1-\delta)t)$. We have that

$$S_t^\delta(\zeta') \text{ is measurable with respect to the passage times } \left\{\zeta'_{x,y} \colon x \sim y \text{ and } x,y \in \mathcal{B}((1+\delta)t)\right\}. \quad (5)$$

Moreover, considering the random passage times ζ, there exist constants $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$ depending only on d such that, for all $\delta > c_1 t^{-\frac{1}{2d+4}} (\log t)^{\frac{1}{d+2}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{Q}\left(S_t^\delta(\zeta)\right) \le c_2 t^{2d} \exp\left(-c_3 t^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right).$$

Proof. First we establish (5). Note that the event $\left\{\inf_{x \in \partial^{\mathrm{i}} \mathcal{B}((1+\delta)t)} D(0,x;\zeta) \le t\right\}$ is measurable with respect to the passage times inside $\mathcal{B}((1+\delta)t)$. Then, if this event does not hold, that is under $\left\{\inf_{x \in \partial^{\mathrm{i}} \mathcal{B}((1+\delta)t)} D(0,x;\zeta) > t\right\}$, the event $\left\{\sup_{x \in \partial^{\mathrm{o}} \mathcal{B}((1-\delta)t)} D(0,x;\zeta) \le t\right\}$ is also measurable with respect to the passage times inside $\mathcal{B}((1+\delta)t)$. The second part of the proposition follows directly from Kesten's result [15, Theorem 2]. □

4 Encapsulation of competing first passage percolation

Here we consider two first passage percolation processes that compete for space as they grow through $\mathbb{Z}^d$. One of the processes spreads throughout $\mathbb{Z}^d$ at rate 1, while the other is slower and spreads at rate $\lambda < 1$, with λ being a parameter of the system. We assume that the starting configuration of each process comprises only a finite set of vertices. In this case, one expects that both processes cannot simultanenously grow indefinitely; that is, one of the processes will eventually surround the other, confining it to a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}^d$. This was studied by Häggström and Pemantle [9]. In the proof of our main result, we will employ a refined version of a result in their paper. In particular, we will give a lower bound on the probability that the faster process surrounds the slower one within some fixed time.

First we define the processes precisely. Let ξ^1 denote the faster process so that, for each time $t \ge 0$, $\xi^1(t)$ gives the set of vertices occupied by the faster process at time t. Similarly, let ξ^2 denote the slower process. For each neighbors $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, let $\zeta^1_{x,y}$ and $\zeta^2_{x,y}$ be independent exponential random variables of rate 1 and λ, respectively. For $i \in \{1,2\}$, $\zeta^i_{x,y}$ represents the passage time of process ξ^i through the edge (x,y).

The processes start at disjoint sets $\xi^1(0), \xi^2(0) \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$. Then they spread throughout $\mathbb{Z}^d$ according to the passage times ζ^1 and ζ^2 with the constraint that, whenever a vertex is occupied by either ξ^1 or ξ^2, the other process cannot occupy that vertex afterwards. Therefore, for any $t \ge 0$, we obtain that $\xi^1(t)$ and $\xi^2(t)$ are disjoint sets. More precisely, using the definition of the distance D from (4), we have

$$\xi^1(t) = \left\{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \colon D(x, \xi^1(0); \zeta^1) < D(x, \xi^2(0); \zeta^2) \text{ and } D(x, \xi^1(0); \zeta^1) \le t\right\}$$

and

$$\xi^2(t) = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \colon D(x, \xi^2(0); \zeta^2) < D(x, \xi^1(0); \zeta^1) \text{ and } D(x, \xi^2(0); \zeta^2) \le t \right\}.$$

Given two sets $X_1, X_2, \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, let $\mathbb{Q}_{X_1,X_2}$ denote the probability measure induced by the processes ξ^1, ξ^2 with initial configurations $\xi^1(0) = X_1$ and $\xi^2(0) = X_2$.

The proposition below is a more refined version of a result of Häggström and Pemantle [9, Proposition 2.2]. It establishes that if ξ^2 starts from inside $\mathcal{B}(r)$ for some $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and ξ^1 starts from a single vertex outside of a larger ball $\mathcal{B}(\alpha r)$, for some $\alpha > 1$, then there is initially a large separation between ξ^1 and ξ^2, allowing ξ^1 to surround ξ^2 with high probability. Moreover, we obtain that ξ^1 will eventually confine ξ^2 to some set $\mathcal{B}(R)$ for some given R, and the probability that this happens goes to 1 with α. We need to state this result in a high level of detail, as we will apply it at various scales later in our proofs. We say that an event is *increasing* (resp., *decreasing*) with respect to some passage times ζ if whenever the event holds for ζ it also holds for any passage times ζ' that satisfies $\zeta'_{x,y} \ge \zeta_{x,y}$ (resp., $\zeta'_{x,y} \le \zeta_{x,y}$) for all neighboring $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.

Proposition 4.1. *There exist positive constants c_1, c_2 depending only on d so that, for any $\lambda \in (0,1)$, any $r > 1$, any $\alpha > \left(\frac{1}{\lambda(1-\lambda)}\right)^{c_1}$, and any $x \in \partial^{\mathrm{o}}\mathcal{B}(\alpha r)$, we can define a number R satisfying $R \le \alpha r \exp\left(\frac{c_1}{1-\lambda}\right)$, a time $T = T(R) \le R\left(\frac{11-\lambda}{10}\right)^2$, and an event F that is measurable with respect to the passage times ζ^1, ζ^2 inside $\mathcal{B}\left(R\left(\frac{11-\lambda}{10}\right)^2\right)$ and is increasing with respect to ζ^2 and decreasing with respect to ζ^1 such that*

$$\mathbb{Q}_{x,\mathcal{B}(r)}(F) \ge 1 - \exp\left(-c_2(\lambda(1-\lambda)\alpha r)^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right),$$

and F implies that

$$\xi^1(T) \supset \mathcal{B}(R) \setminus \mathcal{B}\left(\frac{10R}{11-\lambda}\right).$$

In particular, within time T, ξ^1 encapsulates ξ^2 inside $\mathcal{B}(R)$.

We defer the proof of the proposition above to Appendix A. The proof will follow along the lines of [9, Proposition 2.2], but we need to perform some steps with more care, as we need to obtain bounds on the probability that F occurs, to establish bounds on R and T, to derive that F is increasing with respect to η^2 and decreasing with respect to ζ^1, and to obtain the measurability constraints on F.

5 Proof of Theorem 1.2

5.1 Proof overview

We start with a high-level overview of the proof. Below we refer to Figure 7. Since p is small enough, initially η^1 will grow without finding any seed of $\eta^2(0)$, as in Figure 7(a). When η^1 activates a seed of η^2, then we will apply Proposition 4.1 to establish that η^1 will go around η^2, encapsulating it inside a small ball (according to the norm $|\cdot|$). This is illustrated by the encapsulation of C_1 in Figure 7(b). The yellow ball in the picture marks the region inside which the cluster of η^2 will be trapped, and the red circle around it represents the region inside which the whole encapsulation procedure described in Proposition 4.1 takes place. As long as different red circles do not intersect



Figure 7: Illustration of the proof strategy of Theorem 1.2, with the application of the encapsulation procedure of Häggström and Pemantle [9] (cf. Proposition 4.1). White balls indicate seeds of η^2 that were not yet activated, yellow balls represent the regions inside which the activated clusters of η^2 got trapped, and black represents the growth of η^1. The red circle around each yellow ball corresponds to the area inside which the encapsulation procedure of Proposition 4.1 for the cluster of η^2 inside the yellow ball takes place.

one another, the encapsulation of different clusters of η^2 will happen independently. However, when η^1 encounters a large cluster, as it happens with the cluster C_3 in Figure 7(d), the encapsulation procedure will require a larger region to succeed. We will carry this out by developing a multi-scale analysis of the encapsulation procedure, where the size of the region will depend, among other things, on the size of the clusters of $\eta^2(0)$. After the encapsulation takes place, as in Figure 7(e), we are left with a larger yellow ball and a larger red circle. Also, whenever two clusters of $\eta^2(0)$ are close enough such that their corresponding red circles intersect, as it happens with C_2 in Figure 7(c), then the encapsulation cannot be guaranteed to succeed. In this case, we see these clusters as if they were a larger cluster, and perform the encapsulation procedure over a slightly larger region, as in Figure 7(c,d).

There is one caveat in the above description. Suppose η^1 encounters a very large cluster of η^2, for example C_3 in Figure 7(d). It is likely that during the encapsulation of C_3, inside the red circle of this encapsulation, we will find smaller clusters of η^2. This happens in Figure 7(d) with C_4. This does not pose a big problem, since as long as the red circle of the encapsulation of the small clusters do not intersect one another and do not intersect the yellow ball produced by the encapsulation of C_3, the encapsulation of C_3 will succeed. This is illustrated in Figure 7(e), where the encapsulation of C_4 happened inside the encapsulation of C_3. There is yet a subtlety. During the encapsulation of C_4, the advance of η^1 is slowed down, as it needs to make a detour around the growing cluster of C_4. This slowing down could cause the encapsulation of C_3 to fail. Similarly, as η^2 spreads from C_3, η^2 may find vertices that have already been occupied by η^2 due to the spread of η^2 from other non-encapsulated seeds. This would happen, for example, if the yellow ball that grows from C_3 were to intersect the yellow ball that grows from C_4. If this happens before the encapsulation of C_4 ends, then the spread of C_3 gets a small advantage. The area occupied by the spread of η^2 from C_4 can in this case be regarded as being absorbed by the spread of η^2 from C_3, causing C_3 to spread faster than if C_4 were not present. We will need to show that η^1 is not slowed down too much by possible detours around smaller clusters, and η^2 is not sped up too much by the absorption of smaller clusters.

To do this, we will define a sequence of scales $R_1, R_2, \ldots$, where R_k is to measure the radius of the region inside which encapsulation takes place, and R_k is increasing with k. The larger the cluster of seeds of η^2, the larger k must be. We will treat the scales in order, starting from scale 1. This procedure is illustrated in Figure 8 for the encapsulation of the configuration in Figure 7(a). Once all clusters of scale $k-1$ or below have been treated, we look at all remaining (untreated) clusters that

are not too big to be encapsulated at scale k. If two clusters of scale k are too close to each other, so that their corresponding red circles intersect, we will not carry out the encapsulation and will treat these clusters as if they were one cluster from a larger scale, as illustrated in Figure 8(a). After disregarding these, all remaining clusters of scale k are disjoint and can be treated independently. Although small and going very fast to zero with k, the probability that the encapsulation procedure fails is still positive. So it will happen that some encapsulation will fail, as illustrated by the vertex at the top of Figure 8(a). If this happens for some cluster of scale k, we then take the whole area inside the red circle that would have been produced if the encapsulation procedure at scale k had succeeded, and consider it as a larger cluster of $\eta^2(0)$, leaving it to be treated at a larger scale, as in Figure 8(b). Then we turn to the next scale, as in Figure 8(c,d).



Figure 8: Illustration of the multi-scale encapsulation procedure. (a) The encapsulation of all small clusters are analyzed, skipping clusters that are near other clusters. (b) Clusters whose encapsulation in the previous step failed are replaced by larger clusters. (c,d) Clusters of the next scale, or bundles of small clusters that occupy a region of the size of the next scale, are evaluated and so on.

In order to handle the slow down of η^1 due to detours imposed by smaller scales, and the sped up of η^2 due to absorption of smaller scales, we will introduce a decreasing sequence of positive numbers $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \ldots$, as follows. In the encapsulation of a cluster C of scale k, we will show not only that η^1 is able to encapsulate C, but also that η^1 does that sufficiently fast. We do this by coupling the spread of η^1 inside the red circle of C with a slower first passage percolation process of rate $\prod_{i=1}^{k} e^{-\epsilon_i}$ that evolves independently of η^2. In other words, this slower first passage percolation process does not need to do a detour around C, but pay the price by having slower passage times. We show that the spread of η^1 around C is faster than that of this slower first passage percolation process. Similarly, we show that, even after absorbing smaller scales, η^2 still spreads slow enough inside the red circle of C, so that we can couple it with a faster first passage percolation process of rate $\lambda \prod_{i=1}^{k} e^{\epsilon_i}$, which evolves independently of everything else. We show using this coupling that the spread of η^2 is slower than that of the faster first passage percolation process. Thus at scale k, η^1 is spreading at rate at least $\prod_{i=1}^{k} e^{-\epsilon_i}$ while η^2 is spreading at rate at most $\lambda \prod_{i=1}^{k} e^{\epsilon_i}$, regardless of what happened at smaller scales. By adequately setting ϵ_k, we can assure that $\prod_{i=1}^{k} e^{-\epsilon_k} > \lambda \prod_{i=1}^{k} e^{\epsilon_k}$ for all k, allowing us to apply Proposition 4.1 at all scales.

The final ingredient is to develop a sistematic way to argue that η^1 produces an infinite cluster. For this we introduce two types of regions, which we call *contagious* and *infected*. We start at scale 1, where all vertices of $\eta^2(0)$ are contagious. Using the configuration in Figure 7(a) as an example, all white balls there are contagious. The contagious vertices that do not belong to large clusters or are not close to other contagious vertices, are treated at scale 1. The other contagious vertices remain contagious for scale 2. Then, for each cluster treated at scale 1, either the encapsulation procedure

is successful or not. If it is successful, then the yellow balls produced by the encapsulation of these clusters are declared infected, and the vertices in these clusters are removed from the set of contagious vertices. In Figure 8(b), the yellow area represents the infected vertices after clusters of scale 1 have been treated. Recall that when an encapsulation is successful, all vertices reached by η^2 from that cluster must be contained inside the yellow area. On the other hand, if the encapsulation is not successful, then all vertices inside the red circle become contagious and go to scale 2, together with the other preselected vertices. An example of this situation is given by the cluster at the top-right corner of Figure 8(b). We carry out this procedure iteratively until there are no more contagious vertices or the origin has been disconnected from infinity by infected vertices. The proof is concluded by showing that η^2 is confined to the set of infected vertices, and that with positive probability the infected vertices will not disconnect the origin from infinity.

Roadmap of the proof. We now proceed to the details of the proof. We split the proof in few sections. We start in Section 5.2 by setting up the multi-scale analysis, specifying the sizes of the scales and some parameters. This will define boxes of multiple scales, and we will classify boxes as being either *good* or *bad*. Roughly speaking, a box will be good if the encapsulation procedure inside the box is successful. The concrete definition of good boxes is done in Section 5.3. In Section 5.4 we estimate the probability that a box is good, independent of what happens outside the box. We then introduce contagious and infected sets in Section 5.5, and show that η^2 is confined to the set of infected vertices. At this point, it remains to show that the set of infected vertices does not disconnect the origin from infinity. For this, we need to control the set of contagious vertices, which can actually grow as we move to larger scales (for example, this happens when some encapsulation procedure fails). The event that a vertex is contagious at some scale k depends on what happens at previous scale. We estimate the probability of such event by establishing a recursion over scales, which we carry out in Section 5.6. With this we have a way to control whether a vertex is infected. In order to show that the origin is not disconnected from infinity by infected vertices, we apply the first moment method. We sum, over all contours around the origin, the probability that this contour contains only infected vertices. Since infected vertices can arise at any scale, we need to look at multi-scale paths and contours of infected vertices, which we do in Section 5.7. We then put all ingredients together and complete the proof of Theorem 1.2 in Section 5.8.

5.2 Multi-scale setup

For any edge (x, y) of the lattice, let $\zeta^1_{x,y}, \zeta^2_{x,y}$ be independent exponential random variables of parameters 1 and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, respectively. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $\zeta^i_{x,y}$ is regarded as the passage time of η^i through (x, y); that is, when η^i occupies x, then after time $\zeta^i(x, y)$ we have that $\eta^i(x, y)$ will occupy y provided that y has not been occupied by the other type.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be fixed and small enough so that all inequalities below hold:

$$\lambda e^{2x} < \lambda(1 + 3x) < 1 - 2x \quad \text{for all } x \in (0, \epsilon]. \tag{6}$$

Recall that $\mathcal{B}(r)$ is a ball of radius r according to the norm induced by the shape theorem of first passage percolation with passage times that are exponential random variables of rate 1. We can define positive constants $C_{\mathrm{FPP}} < C'_{\mathrm{FPP}}$, depending only on d, such that for all $r > 0$ we have

$$[-C_{\mathrm{FPP}} r, C_{\mathrm{FPP}} r]^d \subset \mathcal{B}(r) \subset [-C'_{\mathrm{FPP}} r, C'_{\mathrm{FPP}} r]^d. \tag{7}$$

Let L_1 be a large number, and fix $\alpha > 1$ so that it satisfies the conditions in Proposition 4.1. We

let k be an index for the scales. For $k \geq 1$, once L_k has been defined, we set

$$R_k = \inf\left\{ r \geq L_k \colon \mathcal{B}(r) \supset [-10dC'_{\mathrm{FPP}}/C_{\mathrm{FPP}}L_k, 10dC'_{\mathrm{FPP}}/C_{\mathrm{FPP}}L_k]^d \right\}. \tag{8}$$

Also, for $k \geq 1$, define

$$R_k^{\mathrm{enc}} = 2\alpha R_k \exp\left(\frac{1+c_1}{2\epsilon}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad R_k^{\mathrm{outer}} = \frac{72k^2}{\epsilon} R_k^{\mathrm{enc}},$$

where c_1 is the constant in Proposition 4.1. Since $1-\lambda > 2\epsilon$, we have that $\mathcal{B}(R_k^{\mathrm{enc}})$ contains all the passage times according to which the event in Proposition 4.1 with $R = R_k$ is measurable. For $k \geq 2$, let

$$L_k = \inf\left\{ \ell \geq 12C'_{\mathrm{FPP}} R_{k-1}^{\mathrm{outer}} : [-\ell/2, \ell/2]^d \supseteq \mathcal{B}\left(100k^d R_{k-1}^{\mathrm{outer}}\right) \right\}. \tag{9}$$

We then obtain the following bounds for L_k:

$$200C_{\mathrm{FPP}}k^d R_{k-1}^{\mathrm{outer}} \leq L_k \leq 200C'_{\mathrm{FPP}}k^d R_{k-1}^{\mathrm{outer}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{C_{\mathrm{FPP}}^2 R_k}{10dC'_{\mathrm{FPP}}} \leq L_k \leq \frac{C_{\mathrm{FPP}}R_k}{10d}.$$

The first bound follows from (9) and (7), and the fact that in (9) L_k is obtained via an infimum, so any cube containing $\mathcal{B}\left(100k^d R_{k-1}^{\mathrm{outer}}\right)$ must have side length at least L_k. The second bound follows from similar considerations, but applying (8) and (7).

The intuition is that L_k is the size of scale k, and R_k is the radius of the clusters of $\eta^2(0)$ to be treated at scale k. R_k^{enc} represents the radius inside which the encapsulation takes place, and R_k^{outer} represents the red circle, which is larger than R_k^{enc} to allow the coupling that handles the detours of η^1 and the absorptions of η^2 from the interaction with smaller scales.

With the definitions above we obtain

$$R_k^{\mathrm{outer}} = \frac{144\alpha \exp\left(\frac{1+c_1}{2\epsilon}\right)}{\epsilon} k^2 R_k \leq \frac{1440C'_{\mathrm{FPP}}\, d\, \alpha \exp\left(\frac{1+c_1}{2\epsilon}\right)}{\epsilon C_{\mathrm{FPP}}^2} k^2 L_k \leq ck^{d+2} R_{k-1}^{\mathrm{outer}}, \tag{10}$$

for some constant $c = c(d, \epsilon, \alpha) > 0$. Iterating the above bound, we obtain

$$R_k^{\mathrm{outer}} \leq c^{k-1}\,(k!)^{d+2}\, R_1^{\mathrm{outer}} \leq \left(\frac{1440C'_{\mathrm{FPP}}\, d\, \alpha \exp\left(\frac{1+c_1}{2\epsilon}\right)}{\epsilon C_{\mathrm{FPP}}^2}\right) c^{k-1}\,(k!)^{d+2}\, L_1. \tag{11}$$

Using similar reasons we can see that

$$R_k \geq \frac{10dL_k}{C_{\mathrm{FPP}}} \geq 2000dk^d R_{k-1}^{\mathrm{outer}} = \frac{288000d\alpha k^{d+2} \exp\left(\frac{1+c_1}{2\epsilon}\right)}{\epsilon} R_{k-1}, \tag{12}$$

which allows us to conclude that

$$R_k \geq c^{k-1}(k!)^{d+2} R_1 \geq \left(100\frac{k^2}{\epsilon}\right)^{3d+6} \qquad \text{for all } k \geq 1,$$

where c is a positive constant depending on α, ϵ, and d, and the last step follows by setting L_1 large enough.

At each scale $k \geq 1$, tessellate $\mathbb{Z}^d$ into cubes of side-length L_k, producing a collection of disjoint cubes

$$\{Q_k^{\mathrm{core}}(i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d}, \text{ where } Q_k^{\mathrm{core}}(i) = L_k i + [-L_k/2, L_k/2]^d. \tag{13}$$

Whenever we refer to a *cube* in $\mathbb{Z}^d$, we will only consider cubes of the form $\prod_{i=1}^d [a_i, b_i]$ for reals $a_i < b_i$, $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, d\}$. We will need cubes at each scale to overlap. We then define the following collection of cubes

$$\{Q_k(i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^d}, \text{ where } Q_k(i) = L_k i + [-10dL_k, 10dL_k]^d.$$

We refer to each such cube of scale k as a *k-box*, and note that $Q_k(i) \supset Q_k^{\text{core}}(i)$. One important property is that

$$\text{if a subset } A \subset \mathbb{Z}^d \text{ is completely contained inside a cube of side length } 18dL_k,$$
$$\text{then } \exists i \in \mathbb{Z}^d \text{ such that } A \subset Q_k(i).$$

As described in the proof overview (see Section 5.1), when going from scale k to scale $k+1$, we will need to consider a slowed down version of η^1 and a sped up version of η^2. For this reason we set $\epsilon_1 = 0$ and define for $k \geq 2$

$$\epsilon_k = \frac{\epsilon}{k^2}.$$

At scale k, we let the passage times of η^1, η^2 be exponential random variables of mean λ_k^1 and λ_k^2, respectively. Set $\lambda_1^1 = 1$ and $\lambda_1^2 = \lambda$, and let $\zeta_1^1 = \zeta^1$ and $\zeta_1^2 = \zeta^2$ be the passage times used by η^1 and η^2, respectively. For $k \geq 2$, define

$$\lambda_k^1 = \exp\left(-\sum\nolimits_{i=2}^k \epsilon_i\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_k^2 = \lambda \exp\left(\sum\nolimits_{i=2}^k \epsilon_i\right).$$

We have that $\lambda_k^1 > \lambda_{k+1}^1$ and $\lambda_k^2 < \lambda_{k+1}^2$ for all $k \geq 1$. Also, note that

$$\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \epsilon_k \leq \epsilon \int_1^{\infty} x^{-2}\, dx = \epsilon,$$

which gives

$$\lambda_k^1 > e^{-\epsilon} \geq 1 - \epsilon > \lambda e^{\epsilon} > \lambda_k^2 \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1,$$

where the third inequality follows from the bound on ϵ via (6).

For each $k \geq 2$, consider two collections of passage times ζ_k^1 and ζ_k^2 on the edges of $\mathbb{Z}^d$, which are given by $\frac{\zeta^1}{\lambda_k^1}$ and $\frac{\zeta^2 \lambda}{\lambda_k^2}$, respectively. These will be the passage times we will use in the analysis of η^1, η^2 at scale k. Note that, for any given k, the passage times of ζ_k^1 and ζ_k^2 are independent exponential random variables of parameter λ_k^1 and λ_k^2, respectively. Also, scaling time we obtain that having η^1, η^2 spread with rates λ_k^1, λ_k^2 is equivalent to having them spread with rates 1 and $\frac{\lambda_k^2}{\lambda_k^1}$. Therefore, let $\lambda_k^{\text{eff}} = \frac{\lambda_k^2}{\lambda_k^1}$ be the *effective* rate of spread of η^2 in comparison with that of η^1 at scale k. We obtain that

$$\lambda < \lambda_k^{\text{eff}} \leq \frac{\lambda e^{\epsilon}}{e^{-\epsilon}} = \lambda e^{2\epsilon} < 1 - 2\epsilon. \tag{14}$$

Thus the effective rate of spread of η^2 is smaller than 1 at all scales. Finally, for $k \geq 1$, define

$$T_k^1 = R_k^{\text{enc}} \left(\frac{11 - \lambda}{10}\right)^2 \geq R_k^{\text{enc}} \left(\frac{11 - \lambda_k^{\text{eff}}}{10}\right)^2.$$

T_k^1 represents the time required to run each encapsulation procedure at scale k.

5.3 Definition of good boxes

For each $Q_k(i)$, we will apply Proposition 4.1 to handle the situation where $Q_k(i)$ entirely contains a cluster of $\eta^2(0)$. At scale k we will only handle the clusters that have not already been handled at a scale smaller than k. By the relation between L_k and R_k, the cluster of η^2 inside $Q_k(i)$ will not start growing before η^1 reaches the boundary of $L_k i + \mathcal{B}(R_k)$. By the time η^1 reaches the boundary of $L_k i + \mathcal{B}(R_k)$, η^1 must have crossed the boundary of $L_k i + \mathcal{B}(\alpha R_k)$. (For the moment we assume that $L_k i + \mathcal{B}(\alpha R_k)$ does not contain the origin, otherwise we will later consider that the origin has already been disconnected from infinity by η^2.) At this point we apply Proposition 4.1 with $r = R_k$, obtaining values $R \le \alpha R_k \exp\left(\frac{c_1}{1-\lambda_k^{\text{eff}}}\right) \le R_k^{\text{enc}}$ and $T \le T_k^1$. For this, let $E_k(i,x)$ with $x \in L_k i + \mathcal{B}(\alpha R_k) \setminus \mathcal{B}(\alpha R_k/2)$, be the event in the application of Proposition 4.1 with the origin at $L_k i$, $r = R_k$, passage times given by ζ_k^1, ζ_k^2, and η^1 starting from x. Here x represents the first vertex of $\partial^{\text{o}}(L_k i + \mathcal{B}(\alpha R_k))$ occupied by η^1, from where the encapsulation of the cluster of η^2 inside $L_k i + \mathcal{B}(R_k^{\text{enc}})$ will start. Letting $B_k(i) = (L_k i + \mathcal{B}(\alpha R_k) \setminus \mathcal{B}(\alpha R_k/2)) \cup \partial^{\text{o}}(L_k i + \mathcal{B}(\alpha R_k))$, define

$$G_k^{\text{enc}}(i) \text{ to be the event that } E_k(i,x) \text{ holds for all } x \in B_k(i).$$

The event $G_k^{\text{enc}}(i)$ implies that η^1 encapsulates η^2 inside $L_k i + \mathcal{B}(R_k^{\text{enc}})$ during a time interval of length T_k^1, unless η^2 "invades" $L_k i + \mathcal{B}(R_k^{\text{enc}})$ from outside, that is, unless another cluster of η^2 starts growing and reaches the boundary of $L_k i + \mathcal{B}(R_k^{\text{enc}})$ before η^1 manages to encapsulate η^2 inside $L_k i + \mathcal{B}(R_k^{\text{enc}})$.

For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, define

$$Q_k^{\alpha}(i) = L_k i + \mathcal{B}(\alpha R_k), \quad Q_k^{\text{enc}}(i) = L_k i + \mathcal{B}(R_k^{\text{enc}}),$$
$$Q_k^{\text{outer}}(i) = L_k i + \mathcal{B}\left(R_k^{\text{outer}}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad Q_k^{\text{outer}/3}(i) = L_k i + \mathcal{B}\left(R_k^{\text{outer}}/3\right).$$

We will also define two other events $G_k^1(i)$ and $G_k^2(i)$, which will be measurable with respect to ζ_k^1, ζ_k^2 inside $Q_k^{\text{outer}}(i)$. For any $X \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, let $\zeta_k^1|_X$ be the passage times that are equal to ζ_k^1 inside X and are equal to infinity everywhere else; define $\zeta_k^2|_X$ analogously. Define the event $G_k^1(i)$ as

$$\left\{ D\big(\partial^{\text{o}} Q_k^{\text{enc}}(i), \partial^{\text{i}} Q_k^{\text{outer}/3}(i); \zeta_{k+1}^1|_{Q_k^{\text{outer}}(i)}\big) \ge T_k^1 + \sup_{x \in \partial^{\text{i}} Q_k^{\text{outer}/3}(i)} D\big(\partial^{\text{o}} Q_k^{\alpha}(i), x; \zeta_k^1|_{Q_k^{\text{outer}}(i)}\big) \right\}.$$

The main intuition behind this event is that, during the encapsulation of a $(k+1)$-box, η^1 will need to perform some small local detours when encapsulating clusters of scale k or smaller. We can capture this by using the slower passage times ζ_{k+1}^1. If G_k^1 holds for the k-boxes that are traversed during the encapsulation of a $(k+1)$-box, then using the slower passage times ζ_{k+1}^1 but ignoring the actual detours around k-boxes will only slow down η^1.

We also need to handle the case where the growth of η^2 is sped up by absorption of smaller scales. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, define

$$G_k^2(i) = \left\{ D\big(\partial^{\text{o}} Q_k^{\text{enc}}(i), \partial^{\text{i}} Q_k^{\text{outer}/3}(i); \zeta_k^2|_{Q_k^{\text{outer}}(i)}\big) \ge \sup_{x \in Q_k^{\text{enc}}(i), y \in \partial^{\text{i}} Q_k^{\text{outer}/3}(i)} D\big(x, y; \zeta_{k+1}^2|_{Q_k^{\text{outer}}(i)}\big) \right\}.$$

Note that the event $G_k^2(i)$ implies the following. Let $x \in \partial^{\text{i}} Q_k^{\text{outer}/3}(i)$ be the first vertex of $Q_k^{\text{outer}/3}(i)$ reached by η^2 from outside $Q_k^{\text{outer}/3}(i)$. While η^2 travels from x to $Q_k^{\text{enc}}(i)$, the encapsulation of $Q_k^{\text{enc}}(i)$ may start taking place. Then, the advance of η^2 can only get a sped up inside $Q_k^{\text{enc}}(i)$ if η^2 enters $Q_k^{\text{enc}}(i)$ before the encapsulation of $Q_k^{\text{enc}}(i)$ is completed. However, under $G_k^2(i)$ and the

passage times ζ_k^2, the time that η^2 takes to go from x to $Q_k^{\text{enc}}(i)$ is larger than the time, under ζ_{k+1}^2, that η^2 takes to go from x to all vertices in $Q_k^{\text{enc}}(i)$. Therefore, under $G_k^2(i)$, we can use the faster passage times ζ_{k+1}^2 to absorb the possible sped up that η^2 may get by the cluster growing inside $Q_k^{\text{enc}}(i)$.

For $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $k \geq 1$, we define

$$G_k(i) = G_k^{\text{enc}}(i) \cap G_k^1(i) \cap G_k^2(i),$$

and say that

$$Q_k(i) \text{ is } \textit{good} \text{ if } G_k(i) \text{ holds.}$$

Hence, intuitively, $Q_k(i)$ being good means that η^1 successfully encapsulates the growing cluster of η^2 inside $Q_k(i)$, and this happens in such a way that the detour of η^1 during this encapsulation is faster than letting η^1 use passage times ζ_{k+1}^1, and also the possible sped up that η^2 may get from clusters of η^2 coming from outside $Q_k(i)$ is slower than letting η^2 use passage times ζ_{k+1}^2.

We now explain why in the definition of $G_k^1(i)$ and $G_k^2(i)$ we calculate passage times from $\partial Q_k^{\text{outer}/3}(i)$ instead of from $\partial Q_k^{\text{outer}}(i)$. The reason is that we had to define $G_k^1(i)$ and $G_k^2(i)$ in such a way that they are measurable with respect to the passage times inside $Q_k^{\text{outer}}(i)$. We do this by forcing to use only passage times inside $Q_k^{\text{outer}}(i)$. By using the distance between $\partial Q_k^{\text{outer}}(i)$ and $\partial Q_k^{\text{outer}/3}(i)$, we can assure that this constraint does not change much the probability that the corresponding events occur.

5.4 Probability of good boxes

In this section we show that the events $G_k^{\text{enc}}(i)$, $G_k^1(i)$ and $G_k^2(i)$, defined in Section 5.3, are likely to occur.

Lemma 5.1. *There exist positive constants $L_0 = L_0(d, \epsilon)$ and $c = c(d)$ such that if $L_1 \geq L_0$, then for any $k \geq 1$ and any $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(G_k(i)\right) \geq 1 - \exp\left(-c\left(\epsilon\lambda R_k^{\text{enc}}\right)^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right).$$

Moreover, the event $G_k(i)$ is measurable with respect to the passage times inside $Q_k^{\text{outer}}(i)$.

Before proving the lemma above, we state and prove two lemmas regarding the probability of the events $G_k^1(i)$ and $G_k^2(i)$.

Lemma 5.2. *There exist positive constants $L_0 = L_0(d, \epsilon)$ and $c = c(d)$ such that if $L_1 \geq L_0$, then for any $k \geq 1$ and any $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(G_k^1(i)\right) \geq 1 - \exp\left(-c\left(R_k^{\text{outer}}\right)^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right).$$

Proof. Set $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{120k^2}$. Define

$$\tau_1 = \left(\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon} - 1\right)\frac{1}{\lambda_{k+1}^1}R_k^{\text{enc}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_2 = \frac{24k^2}{\epsilon\lambda_k^1}R_k^{\text{enc}}.$$

We will show that there exists a constant $c = c(d) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(D\big(\partial^{\mathrm{o}} Q_k^{\mathrm{enc}}(i), \partial^{\mathrm{i}} Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}/3}(i); \zeta_{k+1}^1|_{Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}}(i)}\big) \le (1-\delta)\tau_1\right) \le (R_k^{\mathrm{outer}})^{3d} \exp\left(-c(R_k^{\mathrm{outer}})^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right), \quad (15)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x\in\partial^{\mathrm{i}} Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}/3}(i)} D\big(\partial^{\mathrm{o}} Q_k^{\alpha}(i), x; \zeta_k^1|_{Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}}(i)}\big) \ge (1+\delta)\tau_2\right) \le \frac{c}{1-2\epsilon}(R_k^{\mathrm{outer}})^{2d} \exp\left(-c(R_k^{\mathrm{outer}})^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right). \quad (16)$$

Using (15) and (16), it remains to show that

$$(1-\delta)\tau_1 \ge T_k^1 + (1+\delta)\tau_2.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
(1-\delta)\tau_1 &= (1-\delta)\left(\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon} - 1\right)\frac{\exp\left(\epsilon(k+1)^{-2}\right)}{\lambda_k^1} R_k^{\mathrm{enc}} \\
&= T_k^1 + \left((1-\delta)\left(\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon} - 1\right)\frac{\exp\left(\epsilon(k+1)^{-2}\right)}{\lambda_k^1} - \left(\frac{11-\lambda}{10}\right)^2\right) R_k^{\mathrm{enc}} \\
&\ge T_k^1 + \left((1-\delta)\left(\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon} - 1\right)\exp\left(\epsilon(k+1)^{-2}\right) - \left(\frac{11-\lambda}{10}\right)^2\right)\frac{R_k^{\mathrm{enc}}}{\lambda_k^1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we need to show that the last term in the right-hand side above is at least $(1+\delta)\tau_2$, which is equivalent to showing that

$$(1-\delta)\left(\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon} - 1\right)\exp\left(\epsilon(k+1)^{-2}\right) - \left(\frac{11-\lambda}{10}\right)^2 \ge (1+\delta)\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon}.$$

Rearranging the terms, the inequality above translates to

$$\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon}\left((1-\delta)\exp\left(\epsilon(k+1)^{-2}\right) - 1 - \delta\right) \ge \left(\frac{11-\lambda}{10}\right)^2 + (1-\delta)\exp\left(\epsilon(k+1)^{-2}\right).$$

Using that $\exp\left(\epsilon(k+1)^{-2}\right) \ge 1 + \epsilon(k+1)^{-2}$ and then applying the value of δ, we obtain that the left-hand side above is at least

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon}\left(\epsilon(k+1)^{-2} - 2\delta - \delta\epsilon(k+1)^{-2}\right) &= 24\left(\frac{k^2}{(k+1)^2} - \frac{1}{60} - \frac{\epsilon}{120(k+1)^2}\right) \\
&\ge 24\left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{60} - \frac{1}{480}\right) > 5.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, it now suffices to show that

$$5 \ge \left(\frac{11-\lambda}{10}\right)^2 + (1-\delta)\exp\left(\epsilon(k+1)^{-2}\right),$$

which is true since the right-hand side above is at most $\left(\frac{11-\lambda}{10}\right)^2 + \exp(\epsilon/4) \le \left(\frac{11}{10}\right)^2 + \exp(1/4) \le 3$.

Now we turn to establish (15) and (16). We start with (15). First note that

$$R_k^{\mathrm{outer}}/3 - R_k^{\mathrm{enc}} = \left(\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon} - 1\right) R_k^{\mathrm{enc}} = \tau_1 \lambda_{k+1}^1.$$

Recall the notation S_t^δ from Proposition 3.1, which is the (unlikely) event that first passage percolation of rate 1 does not contain $\mathcal{B}((1-\delta)t)$ or is not contained in $\mathcal{B}((1+\delta)t)$. Then using time scaling to go from passage times of rate λ_{k+1}^1 to passage times of rate 1, and using the union bound on x, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(D\big(\partial^{\mathrm{o}}Q_k^{\mathrm{enc}}(i), \partial^{\mathrm{i}}Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}/3}(i); \zeta_{k+1}^1|_{Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}}(i)}\big) \le (1-\delta)\tau_1\right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(D\big(\partial^{\mathrm{o}}Q_k^{\mathrm{enc}}(i), \partial^{\mathrm{i}}Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}/3}(i); \zeta_1^1|_{Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}}(i)}\big) \le (1-\delta)\tau_1\lambda_{k+1}^1\right) \\
&\le \sum\nolimits_{x\in\partial^{\mathrm{i}}Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}/3}(i)} \mathbb{Q}\left(S^\delta_{(1-\delta)\tau_1\lambda_{k+1}^1}\right) \\
&\le c_1\left((1-\delta)\tau_1\lambda_{k+1}^1\right)^{3d}\exp\left(-c_2\left((1-\delta)\tau_1\lambda_{k+1}^1\right)^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right) \\
&\le c_1(R_k^{\mathrm{outer}})^{3d}\exp\left(-c_3(R_k^{\mathrm{outer}})^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we used that $(1+\delta)(1-\delta)\tau_1\lambda_{k+1}^1 \le \tau_1\lambda_{k+1}^1 = R_k^{\mathrm{outer}}/3 - R_k^{\mathrm{enc}}$, and in the second inequality we applied Proposition 3.1.

Now we turn to (16). We again use time scaling and the fact that $\tau_2\lambda_k^1 = R_k^{\mathrm{outer}}/3$ to write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\sup\nolimits_{x\in\partial^{\mathrm{i}}Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}/3}(i)} D\Big(\partial^{\mathrm{o}}Q_k^{\alpha}(i), x; \zeta_k^1|_{Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}}(i)}\Big) \ge (1+\delta)\tau_2\right) \\
&\le \mathbb{P}\left(\sup\nolimits_{x\in\partial^{\mathrm{i}}Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}/3}(i)} D\Big(L_k i, x; \zeta_k^1|_{Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}}(i)}\Big) \ge (1+\delta)\tau_2\right) \\
&\le \sum\nolimits_{x\in\partial^{\mathrm{i}}Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}/3}(i)} \mathbb{Q}\left(S^{\delta/2}_{(1+\delta)\tau_2\lambda_k^1}\right) \\
&\le c_1\left(R_k^{\mathrm{outer}}\right)^{3d}\exp\left(-c_2\left(R_k^{\mathrm{outer}}\right)^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows since $(1-\delta/2)(1+\delta)\tau_2\lambda_k^1 \ge R_k^{\mathrm{outer}}/3$ for all $\delta\in[0,1]$. Moreover, $(1+\delta/2)(1+\delta)\tau_2\lambda_k^1 < \frac{2R_k^{\mathrm{outer}}}{3}$, implying that $S^{\delta/2}_{(1+\delta)\tau_2\lambda_k^1}$ is measurable with respect to the passage times inside $Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}}(i)$. Finally, the last step of the derivation above follows from Propositon 3.1. □

The next lemma shows that $G_k^2(i)$ occurs with high probability.

Lemma 5.3. *There exist positive constants $L_0 = L_0(d,\epsilon)$ and $c = c(d)$ such that if $L_1 \ge L_0$, then for any $k \ge 1$ and any $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(G_k^2(i)\right) \ge 1 - \exp\left(-c\left(R_k^{\mathrm{outer}}\right)^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right).$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 5.2. Set $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{20k^2}$ and define

$$\tau_1 = \left(\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon} - 1\right)\frac{R_k^{\mathrm{enc}}}{\lambda_k^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_2 = \left(\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon} + 1\right)\frac{R_k^{\mathrm{enc}}}{\lambda_{k+1}^2}.$$

We will show that there exists a constant $c = c(d) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(D\big(\partial^{\mathrm{o}}Q_k^{\mathrm{enc}}(i), \partial^{\mathrm{i}}Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}/3}(i); \zeta_k^2|_{Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}}(i)}\big) \le (1-\delta)\tau_1\right) \le (R_k^{\mathrm{outer}})^{3d}\exp\left(-c(R_k^{\mathrm{outer}})^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right), \quad (17)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x\in\partial^{\mathrm{o}}Q_k^{\mathrm{enc}}(i),y\in\partial^{\mathrm{i}}Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}/3}(i)} D\Big(x,y;\zeta^2_{k+1}|_{Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}}(i)}\Big)\geq(1+\delta)\tau_2\right)\leq c(R_k^{\mathrm{outer}})^{3d}\exp\left(-c(R_k^{\mathrm{outer}})^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right). \tag{18}$$

Using (17) and (18), it remains to show that

$$(1-\delta)\tau_1\geq(1+\delta)\tau_2. \tag{19}$$

Using the values of τ_1 and τ_2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(1-\delta)\tau_1&=(1-\delta)\left(\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon}-1\right)\frac{R_k^{\mathrm{enc}}}{\lambda_k^2}\\&=\frac{R_k^{\mathrm{enc}}}{\lambda_k^2}\left((1-\delta)\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon}-1+\delta\right)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}(1+\delta)\tau_2&=(1+\delta)\left(\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon}+1\right)\frac{\exp\left(-\epsilon(k+1)^{-2}\right)}{\lambda_k^2}R_k^{\mathrm{enc}}\\&=\frac{R_k^{\mathrm{enc}}}{\lambda_k^2}\left(\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon}(1+\delta)\exp\left(-\epsilon(k+1)^{-2}\right)+(1+\delta)\exp\left(-\epsilon(k+1)^{-2}\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

So it suffices to show that

$$\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon}\left(1-\delta-(1+\delta)\exp\left(-\epsilon(k+1)^{-2}\right)\right)\geq(1+\delta)\exp\left(-\epsilon(k+1)^{-2}\right)+1-\delta.$$

The right-hand side above is at most 2, so (19) follows since

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon}\left(1-\delta-(1+\delta)\exp\left(-\epsilon(k+1)^{-2}\right)\right)\\&\geq\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon}\left(1-\delta-(1+\delta)\left(1-\epsilon(k+1)^{-2}+\frac{\epsilon^2(k+1)^{-4}}{2}\right)\right)\\&\geq\frac{24k^2}{\epsilon}\left(\epsilon(k+1)^{-2}-2\delta-\frac{\epsilon^2(k+1)^{-4}}{2}\right)\\&\geq 24\left(\frac{k^2}{(k+1)^2}-\frac{1}{10}-\frac{\epsilon k^2}{2(k+1)^4}\right)\geq 24\left(\frac{1}{4}-\frac{1}{10}-\frac{1}{32}\right)>2,\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $e^{-x}\leq 1-x+x^2/2$ for all $x\geq 0$, and $\epsilon\in(0,1)$.

Now we turn to establish (17) and (18). We start with (17). Using time scaling to go from passage times of rate λ_k^2 to passage times of rate 1, using the union bound, and noting that $\frac{R_k^{\mathrm{outer}}}{3}-R_k^{\mathrm{enc}}=\tau_1\lambda_k^2\geq(1+\delta)(1-\delta)\tau_1\lambda_k^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(D\Big(\partial^{\mathrm{o}}Q_k^{\mathrm{enc}}(i),\partial^{\mathrm{i}}Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}/3}(i);\zeta_k^2|_{Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}}(i)}\Big)\leq(1-\delta)\tau_1\right)&\leq\sum_{x\in\partial^{\mathrm{i}}Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}/3}(i)}\mathbb{Q}\left(S^{\delta}_{(1-\delta)\tau_1\lambda_k^2}\right)\\&\leq c_1(R_k^{\mathrm{outer}})^{3d}\exp\left(-c_2(R_k^{\mathrm{outer}})^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from Proposition 3.1.

Now we turn to (18). Again using time scaling and the union bound, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x\in\partial^{\mathrm{o}}Q_k^{\mathrm{enc}}(i),y\in\partial^{\mathrm{i}}Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}/3}(i)} D\Big(x,y;\zeta^2_{k+1}|_{Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}}(i)}\Big)\geq(1+\delta)\tau_2\right)\leq \sum_{x\in\partial^{\mathrm{i}}Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}/3}(i)}\mathbb{Q}\left(S^{\delta/2}_{(1+\delta)\tau_2\lambda^2_{k+1}}\right),$$

where the last step follows since $(1-\delta/2)(1+\delta)\tau_2\lambda^2_{k+1}\geq R_k^{\mathrm{outer}}/3+R_k^{\mathrm{enc}}$. Also, $(1+\delta/2)(1+\delta)\tau_2\lambda^2_{k+1}\leq\frac{2R_k^{\mathrm{outer}}}{3}$, which gives that the event above is measurable with respect to the passage times inside $Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}}(i)$. Using Proposition 3.1, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{x\in\partial^{\mathrm{o}}Q_k^{\mathrm{enc}}(i),y\in\partial^{\mathrm{i}}Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}/3}(i)} D\Big(x,y;\zeta^2_{k+1}|_{Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}}(i)}\Big)\geq(1+\delta)\tau_2\right)\leq c_1\left(R_k^{\mathrm{outer}}\right)^{3d}\exp\left(-c_2(R_k^{\mathrm{outer}})^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right).$$

□

Proof of Lemma 5.1. Proposition 4.1 gives that $G_k^{\mathrm{enc}}(i)$ can be defined so that it is measurable with respect to the passage times inside

$$\begin{aligned}L_ki+\mathcal{B}\left(\alpha R_k\exp\left(\frac{c_1}{1-\lambda_k^{\mathrm{eff}}}\right)\left(\frac{11-\lambda_k^{\mathrm{eff}}}{10}\right)^2\right)&\subseteq L_ki+\mathcal{B}\left(\alpha R_k\exp\left(\frac{c_1}{2\epsilon}\right)\left(\frac{11}{10}\right)^2\right)\\&\subseteq L_ki+\mathcal{B}\left(R_k^{\mathrm{enc}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, Proposition 4.1 gives

$$\mathbb{P}\left(G_k^{\mathrm{enc}}(i)\right)\geq 1-\exp\left(-c\left(\lambda_k^{\mathrm{eff}}\left(1-\lambda_k^{\mathrm{eff}}\right)\alpha R_k\right)^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right)\geq 1-\exp\left(-c\left(2\epsilon\lambda\alpha R_k\right)^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right),$$

where the last step follows by applying the bounds in (14). By definition, the events G_k^1 and $G_k^2(i)$ are measurable with respect to the passage times inside $L_ki+\mathcal{B}\left(R_k^{\mathrm{outer}}\right)$. So the proof is completed by using the bounds in Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3. □

5.5 Contagious and infected sets

As discussed in the proof overview in Section 5.1, for each scale k, we will define a set $C_k\subset\mathbb{Z}^d$ as the set of *contagious* vertices at scale k, and also define a set $I_k\subset\mathbb{Z}^d$ as the set of *infected* vertices at scale k. The main intuition behind such sets is that C_k represents the vertices of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ that need to be handled at scale k or larger, whereas I_k represents the vertices of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ that may be taken by η^2 at scale k. In particular, we will show that the vertices of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ that will be occupied by η^2 are contained in $\bigcup_{k\geq1}I_k$.

At scale 1 we set the contagious vertices as those initially taken by η^2; that is,

$$C_1=\eta^2(0).$$

All clusters of C_1 that belong to good 1-boxes and that are not too close to contagious clusters from other 1-boxes will be "cured" by the encapsulation process described in the previous section. The other vertices of C_1 will become contagious vertices for scale 2, together with the vertices belonging to bad 1-boxes. Using this, define C_k^{bad} as the following subset of the contagious vertices:

$$\left\{x\in C_k\colon\text{for all } i \text{ with } x\in Q_k(i) \text{ we have } iL_k+\mathcal{B}\left(3R_k^{\mathrm{outer}}\right)\cap\left(C_k\setminus Q_k(i)\right)\neq\emptyset\right\}. \tag{20}$$

Intuitively, C_k^{bad} is the set of contagious vertices that cannot be cured at scale k since they are not far enough from other contagious vertices in other k-boxes. Now for the vertices in $C_k \setminus C_k^{\mathrm{bad}}$, the definition of C_k^{bad} gives that we can select a set $\mathcal{I}_k \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ representing k-boxes such that for each $x \in C_k \setminus C_k^{\mathrm{bad}}$ there exists a unique $i \in \mathcal{I}_k$ for which $x \in Q_k(i)$, and for each pair $i, j \in \mathcal{I}_k$, we have $Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}}(i) \cap Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}}(j) = \emptyset$. Then, given C_k, we define I_k as the set of vertices that can be taken by η^2 during the encapsulation of the good k-box, which is more precisely given by

$$I_k = \{Q_k^{\mathrm{enc}}(i) \colon Q_k(i) \text{ is good and } i \in \mathcal{I}_k\}.$$

We then define inductively

$$C_{k+1} = C_k^{\mathrm{bad}} \cup \left\{Q_k^{\mathrm{outer}}(i) \colon Q_k(i) \text{ is bad}\right\}.$$

The lemma below gives that if the contagious sets of scales larger than k are all empty, then η^2 must be contained inside $\bigcup_{j=1}^{k-1} I_j$.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ be arbitrary. Then, for any $k \geq 1$, either we have that*

$$\text{there exists } j > k \text{ and } i \in \mathbb{Z}^d \text{ with } Q_j^{\mathrm{outer}}(i) \cap A \neq \emptyset \text{ for which } Q_j^{\mathrm{core}}(i) \cap C_j \neq \emptyset, \tag{21}$$

or

$$\eta^2(t) \cap A \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{k} I_j \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \tag{22}$$

Proof. We will assume that (21) does not occur; that is,

$$\text{the set } \bigcup_{j>k} \bigcup_{i \colon Q_j^{\mathrm{core}}(i) \cap C_j \neq \emptyset} Q_j^{\mathrm{outer}}(i) \text{ does not intersect } A. \tag{23}$$

The lemma will follow by showing that the above implies (22).

We start with scale 1. Recall that C_1 contains all elements of $\eta^2(0)$. Then, all elements of $C_1 \setminus C_1^{\mathrm{bad}}$ are handled at scale 1. Let $i \in \mathcal{I}_1$, so $Q_1(i)$ intersects $C_1 \setminus C_1^{\mathrm{bad}}$. If $Q_1(i)$ is a good box, the passage times inside $Q_1^{\mathrm{enc}}(i)$ are such that η^1 encapsulates η^2 unless η^2 enters $Q_1^{\mathrm{enc}}(i)$ from outside. When the encapsulation succeeds, we have that the cluster of η^2 growing inside $Q_1^{\mathrm{enc}}(i)$ never exits $Q_1^{\mathrm{enc}}(i) \subset I_1$.

Now we turn to analyzing scale $j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, k\}$. Assume that we have carried out the analysis until scale $j-1$, and showed that all contagious vertices successfully handled at scale smaller than j are contained inside $I_1 \cup I_2 \cup \cdots \cup I_{j-1}$. Consider a cell $Q_j(i)$ of scale j with $i \in \mathcal{I}_j$. During the encapsulation of η^2 inside $Q_j^{\mathrm{enc}}(i)$, it may happen that η^1 advances through a cell $Q_{j-1}(i')$ that was treated at scale $j-1$; that is, $i' \in \mathcal{I}_{j-1}$. (For simplicity of the discussion, we assume here that this cell is of scale $j-1$, but it could be of any scale $j' \leq j-1$.) Note that $Q_{j-1}(i')$ must be good for scale $j-1$ because otherwise cell i would not be treated at scale j. The fact that $Q_{j-1}(i')$ is good implies that the time η^1 takes to go from $\partial^{\mathrm{i}} Q_{j-1}^{\mathrm{outer}/3}(i')$ to all points in $\partial^{\mathrm{i}} Q_{j-1}^{\mathrm{enc}}(i')$, therefore encapsulating $Q_{j-1}(i')$, is smaller than the time given by the passage times ζ_j^1. Here we have to use Proposition 4.1 with the additional flexibility discussed in Remark A.4; the description below uses the construction and notation in the proof of Proposition 4.1 from Appendix A. The problem of applying Proposition 4.1 directly is that at the nth step of the encapsulation, when η^1 is moving from A_{n-1} to A_n, there may be cells of smaller scale intersecting A_{n-1} and A_n. The idea is to replace A_n by the set $\bar{A}_n$ defined as the set of points within distance $2R_{j-1}^{\mathrm{outer}}$ from A_n. This set

contains all cells handled at smaller scales that intersect with A_n. So if the passage times of ζ_j are fast enough from A_{n-1} to A_n we obtain that η^1 will occupy a subset of $\bar{A}_n$ that disconnects A_n from $\partial^{\mathrm{o}}\bar{A}_n$. This will be the set $\tilde{A}_n$ mentioned in Remark A.4. Note that this set is closer to A_{n+1} than A_n, which allows us to carry out the same argument in the successive steps. It only remains to check (40), but this is satisfied since

$$2R_{j-1}^{\mathrm{outer}} \leq \frac{2\epsilon R_j}{288000\alpha j^{d+2}} \leq \frac{1-\lambda}{10}\alpha R_j,$$

where the first inequality follows from (12). This gives that $Q_j(i)$ being good implies that the passage times ζ_j^1 satisfy the requirements of Proposition 4.1.

It remains to check that the passage times ζ_j^2 also satisfy the requirements for Proposition 4.1. Consider that in the encapsulation of η^2 inside $Q_j^{\mathrm{enc}}(i)$, η^2 enters from outside a cell $Q_{j-1}^{\mathrm{enc}}(i')$ that is good for scale $j-1$ and with $i' \in \mathcal{I}_{j-1}$. Then the time it takes η^2 to go from $\partial^{\mathrm{i}}Q_{j-1}^{\mathrm{outer}/3}(i')$ to $\partial^{\mathrm{o}}Q_{j-1}^{\mathrm{enc}}(i')$ is larger than the passage time according to ζ_j^2 from $\partial^{\mathrm{i}}Q_{j-1}^{\mathrm{outer}/3}(i')$ to any point of $Q_{j-1}^{\mathrm{enc}}(i')$. This means that the passage times according to ζ_j^2, which disregard whether vertices were previously taken by the cluster of η^2 growing inside $Q_{j-1}^{\mathrm{enc}}(i')$, are faster than the actual time taken by η^2. Since the encapsulation is an increasing event for η^2, it suffices to consider the passage times ζ_j^2, regardless of whether vertices of $Q_{j-1}^{\mathrm{enc}}(i')$ were taken by η^1 or η^2. Hence ζ_j^2 also satisfies the requirements for Proposition 4.1, and we obtain that η^2 cannot escape the set $\bigcup_{\iota=1}^{j} I_\iota$, after all contagious vertices of scale at most j have been analyzed. Therefore, inductively we obtain that $\eta^2(t) \subset \bigcup_{\iota=1}^{\infty} I_\iota$.

For scales larger than k, we will use that (23) holds. Since for any scale j and any $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we have that

$$\bigcup\nolimits_{i':Q_j(i')\cap Q_j^{\mathrm{core}}(i)\neq\emptyset} Q_j^{\mathrm{enc}}(i') \subset Q_j^{\mathrm{outer}}(i),$$

we obtain

$$\bigcup\nolimits_{j>k} I_j = \bigcup\nolimits_{j>k}\bigcup\nolimits_{i\in\mathcal{I}_j} Q_j^{\mathrm{enc}}(i) \subset \bigcup\nolimits_{j>k}\bigcup\nolimits_{i:\ Q_j^{\mathrm{core}}(i)\cap C_j\neq\emptyset} Q_j^{\mathrm{outer}}(i).$$

This and (23) give that $\bigcup_{j>k} I_j$ does not intersect A, hence $\eta^2(t)\cap A \subset \bigcup_{\iota=1}^{k} I_\iota$. □

5.6 Recursion

Define

$$\rho_k(i) = \mathbb{P}\left(Q_k^{\mathrm{core}}(i)\cap C_k \neq \emptyset\right).$$

Recall that $Q_k^{\mathrm{core}}(i)$ are disjoint for different $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, as defined in (13). Define also

$$q_k = \exp\left(-c\left(R_k^{\mathrm{outer}}\right)^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right),$$

where c is the constant in Lemma 5.1 so that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we have $\mathbb{P}\left(G_k(i)\right) \geq 1-q_k$.

The main observation is that in order to have $Q_k^{\mathrm{core}}(i)\cap C_k \neq \emptyset$ it must happen that either

$$\exists j \in \mathbb{Z}^d\colon Q_{k-1}(j) \text{ is bad and } Q_{k-1}^{\mathrm{outer}}(j)\cap Q_k^{\mathrm{core}}(i) \neq \emptyset \tag{24}$$

or

$$\exists x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \colon x, y \in C_{k-1},\ x \in Q_k^{\text{core}}(i),\ y \notin Q_k(\iota),\ y \in \iota L_{k-1} + \mathcal{B}\left(3R_{k-1}^{\text{outer}}\right), \tag{25}$$

where ι is the unique number such that $x \in Q_{k-1}^{\text{core}}(\iota)$. The condition above holds by the following. If (24) does not happen, then there must exist a $x \in C_{k-1} \cap Q_k^{\text{core}}(i)$ that was not treated at scale $k-1$; that is, $x \in C_{k-1}^{\text{bad}}$. Then, by the definition of C_{k-1}^{bad}, it must be the case that there exists a y satisfying the conditions in (25). The values x, y as in (25) must satisfy

$$C_{\text{FPP}}(10d - 1/2)L_{k-1} \leq |x - y| \leq C'_{\text{FPP}} L_{k-1} + 3R_{k-1}^{\text{outer}}.$$

Lemma 5.5. *For any $k \geq 2$ and any $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, define the super cell*

$$Q_k^{\text{super}}(i) = \bigcup_{x \in Q_k^{\text{core}}(i)} \left(x + \mathcal{B}\left(3R_{k-1}^{\text{outer}} + R_{k-1}\right)\right);$$

for $k = 1$, set $Q_1^{\text{super}}(i) = Q_1^{\text{core}}(i)$. Then the event $\{Q_k^{\text{core}}(i) \cap C_k \neq \emptyset\}$ is measurable with respect to $Q_k^{\text{super}}(i)$.

Proof. The theorem is true for $k = 1$ since $\{Q_1^{\text{core}}(i) \cap C_1 \neq \emptyset\}$ is equivalent to $\left\{Q_1^{\text{core}}(i) \cap \eta^2(0) \neq \emptyset\right\}$. Our goal is to apply an induction argument to establish the lemma for $k > 1$. First note that, since the event that a box of scale $k-1$ is good is measurable with respect to passage times inside a ball of diameter R_{k-1}^{outer}, we have that condition (24) is measurable with respect to the passage times inside

$$\bigcup_{x \in Q_k^{\text{core}}(i)} \left(x + \mathcal{B}\left(2R_{k-1}^{\text{outer}}\right)\right).$$

It remains to establish the measurability result for condition (25). Note that condition (25) gives the existence of a point y in $\bigcup_{x \in Q_k^{\text{core}}(i)} \left(x + \mathcal{B}\left(3R_{k-1}^{\text{outer}}\right)\right)$ such that $y \in C_{k-1}$. Let j be the integer such that $y \in Q_{k-1}^{\text{core}}(j)$. Then the induction hypothesis gives that $\{Q_{k-1}^{\text{core}}(j) \cap C_{k-1} \neq \emptyset\}$ is measurable with respect to the passage times inside

$$\bigcup_{x \in Q_{k-1}^{\text{core}}(j)} \left(x + \mathcal{B}\left(3R_{k-2}^{\text{outer}} + R_{k-2}\right)\right) \subset y + \mathcal{B}\left(R_{k-1}\right) \subset Q_k^{\text{super}}(i).$$

Therefore, condition (25) is measurable with respect to the passage times inside $Q_k^{\text{super}}(i)$. □

Lemma 5.6. *There exists a constant $c = c(d, \epsilon, \alpha) > 0$ such that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we have*

$$\rho_k(i) \leq ck^{2d(d+2)} \sup_j \rho_{k-1}^2(j) + ck^{d(d+2)} q_{k-1}.$$

Proof. From the discussion above, we have that $\rho_k(i)$ is bounded above by the probability that condition (24) occurs plus the probability that condition (25) occurs. We start with condition (24). Note that $Q_{k-1}^{\text{core}}(j)$, for j defined as in (24), must be contained inside

$$\bigcup_{x \in Q_k^{\text{core}}(i)} \mathcal{B}\left(R_{k-1}^{\text{outer}} + R_{k-1}\right).$$

Therefore, there is a constant c depending only on d such that the number of options for the value of j is at most

$$c\left(\frac{R_k + R_{k-1}^{\text{outer}} + R_{k-1}}{R_{k-1}}\right)^d \leq c\left(\frac{2R_k}{R_{k-1}}\right)^d \leq c' k^{d(d+2)},$$

for some constant c'. Then, taking the union bound on the value of j, we obtain that the probability that condition (24) occurs is at most

$$c' k^{d(d+2)} q_{k-1}.$$

Now we bound the probability that condition (25) happens. For any $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, let $\varphi(z) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ be such that $z \in Q_{k-1}^{\text{core}}(\varphi(z))$. We will need to estimate the number of different values that $\varphi(x)$ and $\varphi(y)$ can assume. Since $x \in Q_k^{\text{core}}(i)$, we have that $\varphi(x)$ can assume at most $\left(\frac{L_k + 2L_{k-1}}{L_{k-1}}\right)^d$ values. For $\varphi(y)$, first note that any point in $Q_{k-1}^{\text{core}}(\varphi(y))$ must be contained inside $\varphi(x)L_k + [-3C'_{\text{FPP}}R_{k-1}^{\text{outer}} - L_{k-1}, 3C'_{\text{FPP}}R_{k-1}^{\text{outer}} + L_{k-1}]^d$. Therefore, $Q_{k-1}^{\text{core}}(\varphi(y))$ must be contained inside a cube of side length

$$L_k + 6C'_{\text{FPP}}R_{k-1}^{\text{outer}} + 2L_{k-1},$$

and consequently there are at most

$$\left(\frac{L_k + 6C'_{\text{FPP}}R_{k-1}^{\text{outer}} + 2L_{k-1}}{L_{k-1}}\right)^d$$

possible values for $\varphi(y)$. Letting A_k be the number of ways of choosing the Q_{k-1}^{core} boxes containing x, y according to condition (25), we obtain

$$A_k \leq \left(\frac{L_k + 2L_{k-1}}{L_{k-1}}\right)^d \left(\frac{L_k + 6C'_{\text{FPP}}R_{k-1}^{\text{outer}} + 2L_{k-1}}{L_{k-1}}\right)^d \leq c k^{2d(d+2)},$$

for some constant $c = c(d, \epsilon, \alpha) > 0$. Now, given x, y, we want to give an upper bound for

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{Q_{k-1}^{\text{core}}(\varphi(x)) \cap C_{k-1} \neq \emptyset\right\} \cap \left\{Q_{k-1}^{\text{core}}(\varphi(y)) \cap C_{k-1} \neq \emptyset\right\}\right).$$

From Lemma 5.5 we have that the event $\left\{Q_{k-1}^{\text{core}}(\varphi(x)) \cap C_{k-1}\right\}$ is measurable with respect to the passage times inside $Q_{k-1}^{\text{super}}(\varphi(x))$. Since $Q_{k-1}(\varphi(x))$ is contained in $\varphi(x)L_{k-1} + \mathcal{B}(R_{k-1})$, by rescaling the norm we get that $Q_{k-1}^{\text{core}}(\varphi(x))$ is contained in $\varphi(x)L_{k-1} + \mathcal{B}\left(\frac{R_{k-1}}{20d}\right)$. Therefore, for any $z \in Q_{k-1}^{\text{super}}(\varphi(x))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x - z| \leq \frac{R_{k-1}}{10d} + \left(3R_{k-2}^{\text{outer}} + R_{k-2}\right) \leq \frac{R_{k-1}}{10d} + 4R_{k-2}^{\text{outer}} &\leq \frac{R_{k-1}}{10d} + \frac{R_{k-1}}{500d(k-1)^d}, \\ &\leq \frac{R_{k-1}}{5}, \end{aligned}$$

where we related R_{k-2}^{outer} and R_{k-1} via (12). Since $|x - y| > \frac{R_{k-1}}{2}$ we have that $Q_{k-1}^{\text{super}}(\varphi(x)) \cap Q_{k-1}^{\text{super}}(\varphi(y)) = \emptyset$, giving that

$$\rho_k(i) \leq c' k^{d(d+2)} q_{k-1} + A_k \sup_j \rho_{k-1}^2(j).$$

□

In the lemma below, recall that $\eta^2(0)$ is given by adding each vertex of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with probability p, independently of one another. Also let $\bar{\rho}$ be such that $\bar{\rho} \geq \sup_j \rho_1(j)$.

Lemma 5.7. *Fix any positive constant a. We can set L_1 large enough and then p small enough, both depending on a, α, ϵ and d, such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we have*

$$\rho_k(i) \leq \exp\left(-a2^k\right).$$

Proof. For $k = 1$, then $\rho_k(i)$ is bounded above by the probability that $\eta^2(0)$ intersects $Q_k^{\text{core}}(i)$. Once L_1 has been fixed, this probability can be made arbitrarily small by setting p small enough.

Now we assume that $k \geq 2$. We will expand the recursion in Lemma 5.6. Using the same constant c as in Lemma 5.6, define

$$\bar{q}_{k-1} = ck^{d(d+2)} q_{k-1} \quad \text{for all } k \geq 2.$$

Now fix k, set $A_{-1} = 1$, and define for $\ell = 0, 1, \ldots, k-1$

$$A_\ell = A_{\ell-1} 2^{2^\ell - 1} \left(c(k-\ell)^{2d(d+2)}\right)^{2^\ell} = \prod_{m=0}^{\ell} 2^{2^m - 1} \left(c(k-m)^{2d(d+2)}\right)^{2^m}. \tag{26}$$

With this, the recursion in Lemma 5.6 can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_k(i) &\leq A_0 \sup_j \rho_{k-1}^2(j) + \bar{q}_{k-1} \\
&\leq A_0\, 2 \left(\left(c(k-1)^{2d(d+2)}\right)^2 \sup_j \rho_{k-2}^4(j) + \bar{q}_{k-2}^2 \right) + \bar{q}_{k-1} \\
&= A_1 \sup_j \rho_{k-2}^4(j) + 2A_0 q_{k-2}^2 + \bar{q}_{k-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we used that $(x+y)^m \leq 2^{m-1}(x^m + y^m)$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Iterating the above inequality, we obtain

$$\rho_k(i) \leq A_{k-2} \sup_j \rho_1^{2^{k-1}}(j) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} 2^{2^{\ell-1}-1} A_{\ell-2} \bar{q}_{k-\ell}^{2^{\ell-1}} = A_{k-2} \bar{\rho}^{2^{k-1}} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} 2^{2^{\ell-1}-1} A_{\ell-2} \bar{q}_{k-\ell}^{2^{\ell-1}}. \tag{27}$$

We now claim that

$$A_\ell \leq \left(4c^2\, (3(k-\ell))^{5d(d+2)}\right)^{2^\ell} \quad \text{for all } \ell = 0, 1, \ldots, k-1. \tag{28}$$

We can prove (28) by induction on ℓ. Note that A_0 does satisfy the above inequality. Then, using the induction hypothesis and the recursive definition of A_ℓ in (26), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
A_\ell &= A_{\ell-1} 2^{2^\ell - 1} \left(c(k-\ell)^{2d(d+2)}\right)^{2^\ell} \\
&\leq \left(4c^2\, (3(k-\ell+1))^{5d(d+2)}\right)^{2^{\ell-1}} 2^{2^\ell - 1} \left(c(k-\ell)^{2d(d+2)}\right)^{2^\ell} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left(2c\, (3(k-\ell+1))^{5d(d+2)/2}\, 2\, c(k-\ell)^{2d(d+2)}\right)^{2^\ell}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we use that $(x+1)^{5/2} \le 6x^3$ for all $x \ge 1$, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} A_\ell &\le \frac{1}{2}\left(2c\left(3^{5/2}6(k-\ell)^3\right)^{d(d+2)}\, 2\,c(k-\ell)^{2d(d+2)}\right)^{2^\ell} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(4c^2\left(3^{1/2}6^{1/5}(k-\ell)\right)^{5d(d+2)}\right)^{2^\ell} \le \frac{1}{2}\left(4c^2\left(3(k-\ell)\right)^{5d(d+2)}\right)^{2^\ell}, \end{aligned}$$

establishing (28). Plugging (28) into (27), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_k(i) &\le \left(4c^2\, 6^{5d(d+2)}\right)^{2^{k-2}} \bar{\rho}^{2^{k-1}} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1} 2^{2^{\ell-1}-1}\left(4c^2\left(3(k-\ell+2)\right)^{5d(d+2)}\right)^{2^{\ell-2}} \bar{q}_{k-\ell}^{2^{\ell-1}} \\ &\le \left(2c\, 6^{5d(d+2)/2}\bar{\rho}\right)^{2^{k-1}} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\ell=1}^{k-1}\left(4c\left(3(k-\ell+2)\right)^{5d(d+2)/2}\bar{q}_{k-\ell}\right)^{2^{\ell-1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Given a value of L_1, for all small enough p we obtain that $\bar{\rho}$ is sufficiently small to yield

$$\left(2c\, 6^{5d(d+2)/2}\bar{\rho}\right)^{2^{k-1}} \le \frac{1}{2}\exp\left(-a2^k\right).$$

Now we turn to the second term in (29). From Lemma 5.1, we have that $q_{k-\ell} \le \exp\left(-cR_{k-\ell}^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right)$, for some constant $c = c(\alpha, \epsilon, d) > 0$. We have from the relations (10) and (11) that $R_j \le c_1 c_2^j (j!)^d L_1$ for positive constants c_1, c_2. Therefore, for any $k \ge \ell$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(4c\left(3(k-\ell+2)\right)^{5d(d+2)/2}\bar{q}_{k-\ell}\right)^{2^{\ell-1}} &\le \exp\left(-c_3\left((k-\ell)!\right)^{\frac{d(d+1)}{2d+4}} 2^{\ell-1} c_2^{\frac{(k-\ell)(d+1)}{2d+4}} L_1^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right) \\ &\le \exp\left(-c_3 2^k L_1^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we use that $c_2^{\frac{(d+1)}{2d+4}} \ge c_2^{1/3} \ge 2$. Hence, for sufficiently large L_1 we obtain

$$\rho_k(i) \le \frac{1}{2}\exp\left(-a2^k\right) + \frac{k}{2}\exp\left(-c_3 2^k L_1^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right) \le \exp\left(-a2^k\right).$$

□

5.7 Multiscale paths of infected sets

Let $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ be a fixed vertex. We say that $\Gamma = (k_1, i_1), (k_2, i_2), \ldots, (k_\ell, i_\ell)$ is a *multi-scale path* from x if $x \in Q_{k_1}^{\mathrm{enc}}(i_1)$, and for each $j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, \ell\}$ we have $Q_{k_j}^{\mathrm{enc}}(i_j) \cap Q_{k_{j-1}}^{\mathrm{enc}}(i_{j-1}) \ne \emptyset$. Hence,

$$\bigcup\nolimits_{(k,i)\in\Gamma} Q_k^{\mathrm{enc}}(i) \text{ is a connected subset of } \mathbb{Z}^d \text{ and contains } x.$$

Given such a path, we say that the *reach* of Γ is given by $\sup\left\{|z-x|\colon z \in \bigcup_{(k,i)\in\Gamma} Q_k^{\mathrm{enc}}(i)\right\}$, that is, the distance between x and the furthest away point of Γ. We will only consider paths such that $Q_{k_j}^{\mathrm{enc}}(i_j) \subset I_{k_j}$. Recall the way the sets I_κ are constructed from $C_\kappa \setminus C_\kappa^{\mathrm{bad}}$, which is defined in (20). Then for any two $(k,i), (k',i') \in \Gamma$ with $k = k'$ we have $Q_k^{\mathrm{enc}}(i) \cap Q_{k'}^{\mathrm{enc}}(i') = \emptyset$. Therefore,

we impose the additional restriction that on any multi-scale path $\Gamma = (k_1, i_1), (k_2, i_2), \dots, (k_\ell, i_\ell)$ we have $k_j \neq k_{j-1}$ for all $j \in \{2, 3, \dots, \ell\}$.

Now we introduce a subset $\tilde{\Gamma}$ of Γ as follows. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, define

$$Q_k^{\text{neigh}}(i) = iL_k + \mathcal{B}\left(\tfrac{11}{10} R_k^{\text{outer}}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad Q_k^{\text{neigh2}}(i) = iL_k + \mathcal{B}\left(\tfrac{6}{5} R_k^{\text{outer}}\right).$$

Note that $Q_k^{\text{outer}}(i) \subset Q_k^{\text{neigh}}(i) \subset Q_k^{\text{neigh2}}(i)$. Let $\kappa_1 > \kappa_2 > \cdots$ be an ordered list of the scales that appear in cells of Γ. We start constructing $\tilde{\Gamma}$ by adding to it all cells of Γ of scale κ_1. Then, for each $j \geq 2$, after having decided which cells of Γ of scale at least κ_{j-1} we add to $\tilde{\Gamma}$, we add to $\tilde{\Gamma}$ all cells $(k, i) \in \Gamma$ of scale $k = \kappa_j$ such that $Q_k^{\text{neigh}}(i)$ does not intersect $Q_{k'}^{\text{neigh}}(i')$ for each (k', i') already added to $\tilde{\Gamma}$. Recall that, from the definition of C_k^{bad} in (20), two cells $(k, j), (k, j')$ of the same scale that are part of I_k must be such that

$$Q_k(j') \not\subset jL_k + \mathcal{B}\left(3R_k^{\text{outer}}\right).$$

This gives that $|jL_k - j'L_k| \geq 3R_k^{\text{outer}} - R_k$, which implies that $Q_k^{\text{neigh2}}(j)$ and $Q_k^{\text{neigh2}}(j')$ do not intersect.

The idea behind the definitions above is that we will look at "paths" of multi-scale cells such that two neighboring cells in the path are such that their Q^{neigh2} regions intersect, and any two cells in the path have disjoint Q^{neigh} regions. The first property limits the number of cells that can be a neighbor of a given cell, allowing us to control the number of such paths, while the second property allows us to argue that the encapsulation procedure behaves more or less independently for different cells of the path.

Lemma 5.8. *Let $\Gamma = (k_1, i_1), (k_2, i_2), \dots, (k_\ell, i_\ell)$ be a multi-scale path starting from x with reach L. Then, the subset $\tilde{\Gamma}$ defined above is such that*

$$\bigcup\nolimits_{(k,i)\in\tilde{\Gamma}} Q_{k_j}^{\text{neigh2}}(i_j) \text{ is a connected subset of } \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

Furthermore, any point $y \in \bigcup_{(k,i)\in\Gamma} Q_k^{\text{enc}}(i)$ must belong to $\bigcup_{(k,i)\in\tilde{\Gamma}} Q_k^{\text{neigh2}}(i)$.

Proof. Let Υ be an arbitrary subset of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ with $\Upsilon \neq \tilde{\Gamma}$. The first part of the lemma follows by showing that

$$\text{there exists } (\kappa, \iota) \in \tilde{\Gamma} \setminus \Upsilon \text{ such that } Q_\kappa^{\text{neigh2}}(\iota) \text{ intersects } \bigcup\nolimits_{(k,i)\in\Upsilon} Q_k^{\text{neigh2}}(i). \tag{30}$$

Define

$$\Upsilon^{\text{neigh}} = \left\{(k, i) \in \Gamma \colon Q_k^{\text{neigh}}(i) \text{ intersects } Q_{k'}^{\text{neigh}}(i') \text{ for some } (k', i') \in \Upsilon\right\}.$$

Clearly, $\Upsilon^{\text{neigh}} \supset \Upsilon$, and since $\{Q_k^{\text{neigh}}(i) \colon (k, i) \in \tilde{\Gamma}\}$ is by definition a collection of disjoint sets, we have that

$$\text{all elements of } \Upsilon^{\text{neigh}} \setminus \Upsilon \text{ do not belong to } \tilde{\Gamma}.$$

Recall that $\tilde{\Gamma} \neq \Upsilon$, and since no element of $\tilde{\Gamma} \setminus \Upsilon$ was added to Υ^{neigh}, we have that $\Upsilon^{\text{neigh}} \neq \Gamma$. Using that $\bigcup_{(k,i)\in\Gamma} Q_k^{\text{enc}}(i)$ is a connected set, we obtain a value

$$(k, i) \in \Gamma \setminus \Upsilon^{\text{neigh}} \text{ for which } Q_k^{\text{enc}}(i) \text{ intersects } Q_{k'}^{\text{enc}}(i') \subset Q_{k'}^{\text{neigh}}(i') \text{ for some } (k', i') \in \Upsilon^{\text{neigh}}.$$

Refer to Figure 9 for a schematic view of the definitions in this proof. Let (k', i') be the cell of



Figure 9: Illustration of the relations between the variables in the proof of Lemma 5.8. A line from (κ, ι) to (κ', ι') labeled *-∩ indicates that $Q^*_\kappa(\iota) \cap Q^*_{\kappa'}(\iota') \neq \emptyset$.

Υ^{neigh} for which $Q^{\text{enc}}_k(i)$ intersects $Q^{\text{enc}}_{k'}(i')$. Since $(k', i') \in \Upsilon^{\text{neigh}}$, let (k'', i'') be the element of Υ of largest scale for which $Q^{\text{neigh}}_{k'}(i')$ intersects $Q^{\text{neigh}}_{k''}(i'')$; if $(k', i') \in \Upsilon$, then $(k'', i'') = (k', i')$. We obtain that

$$\text{the distance according to } |\cdot| \text{ between } Q^{\text{neigh}}_{k''}(i'') \text{ and } Q^{\text{enc}}_k(i) \ \leq R^{\text{enc}}_{k'} + \tfrac{11}{10} R^{\text{outer}}_{k'}. \tag{31}$$

By the construction of $\tilde{\Gamma}$, and the fact that (k'', i'') was set as the element of largest scale satisfying $Q^{\text{neigh}}_{k''}(i'') \cap Q^{\text{neigh}}_{k'}(i') \neq \emptyset$, we must have that

$$k'' > k' \quad \text{or} \quad (k'', i'') = (k', i').$$

In the former case, the distance in (31) is bounded above by $2R^{\text{outer}}_{k''-1}$, while in the latter case the distance is zero. So we assume that the distance between $Q^{\text{neigh}}_{k''}(i'')$ and $Q^{\text{enc}}_k(i)$ is at most $2R^{\text{outer}}_{k''-1}$, which yields that $Q^{\text{enc}}_k(i)$ intersects $Q^{\text{neigh2}}_{k''}(i'')$. Therefore, if $(k, i) \in \tilde{\Gamma}$, we have (30) and we are done. When $(k, i) \notin \tilde{\Gamma}$, take the cell $(k''', i''') \in \tilde{\Gamma}$ of largest scale such that $Q^{\text{neigh}}_k(i)$ intersects $Q^{\text{neigh}}_{k'''}(i''')$ and, by the construction of $\tilde{\Gamma}$, we have

$$k''' > k.$$

We obtain that $(k''', i''') \notin \Upsilon$, otherwise it would imply that $(k, i) \in \Upsilon^{\text{neigh}}$ violating the definition of (k, i). The distance between $Q^{\text{neigh}}_{k'''}(i''')$ and $Q^{\text{neigh}}_{k''}(i'')$ is at most

$$\tfrac{6}{5} R^{\text{outer}}_k + R^{\text{enc}}_k + 2R^{\text{outer}}_{k''-1} \leq 2\left(R^{\text{outer}}_{k'''-1} + R^{\text{outer}}_{k''-1}\right) \leq \frac{1}{20}\left(R^{\text{outer}}_{k''} + R^{\text{outer}}_{k'''}\right).$$

Therefore, we have that $Q^{\text{neigh2}}_{k''}(i'')$ intersects $Q^{\text{neigh2}}_{k'''}(i''')$, establishing (30) and concluding the first part of the proof.

For the second part, take y to be a point of $Q^{\text{enc}}_k(i)$ with $(k, i) \in \Gamma$. If $(k, i) \in \tilde{\Gamma}$, then the lemma follows. Otherwise, let (κ, ι) be the cell of largest scale in $\tilde{\Gamma}$ such that $Q^{\text{neigh}}_\kappa(\iota) \cap Q^{\text{neigh}}_k(i) \neq \emptyset$. By the construction of $\tilde{\Gamma}$, we have that $\kappa > k$. The distance between y and $Q^{\text{neigh}}_\kappa(\iota)$ is at most

$$R^{\text{enc}}_k + R^{\text{neigh}}_k \leq 2R^{\text{neigh}}_{\kappa-1} \leq \frac{1}{10} R_\kappa,$$

which gives that $y \in Q^{\text{neigh2}}_\kappa(\iota)$. □

Now we define the type of multi-scale paths we will consider.

Definition 5.9. Given $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $m > 0$, we say that $\Gamma = (k_1, i_1), (k_2, i_2), \ldots, (k_\ell, i_\ell)$ is a *well separated path* of reach m starting from x if all the following hold:

(*i*) $x \in Q^{\text{neigh2}}_{k_1}(i_1)$,

(*ii*) for any $j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, \ell\}$ we have that $Q^{\text{neigh2}}_{k_j}(i_j)$ intersects $Q^{\text{neigh2}}_{k_{j-1}}(i_{j-1})$,

(*iii*) for any $j, \iota \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \ell\}$ with $|j - \iota| \geq 2$ we have $Q^{\text{neigh2}}_{k_j}(i_j)$ does not intersect $Q^{\text{neigh2}}_{k_\iota}(i_\iota)$,

(*iv*) for any distinct $j, \iota \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \ell\}$ we have that $Q^{\text{neigh}}_{k_j}(i_j)$ does not intersect $Q^{\text{neigh}}_{k_\iota}(i_\iota)$,

(*v*) for any $j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, \ell\}$, we have $k_j \neq k_{j-1}$,

(*vi*) and the point of $Q^{\text{neigh2}}_{k_\ell}(i_\ell)$ that is furthest away from x is of distance m from x.

We say that a well separated path Γ is *infected* if for all $(k, i) \in \Gamma$ we have $Q^{\text{enc}}_k(i) \subset I_k$. In light of Lemmas 5.4 and 5.8, we have that if the origin is separated from infinity by η^2, there must exist a well separated path that is infected.

Lemma 5.10. *Fix any positive constant c. We can set L_1 large enough and then p small enough, both depending only on c, α, d and ϵ, so that the following holds. For any integer $\ell \geq 1$, any given collection of (not necessarily distinct) integer numbers $k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_\ell$, and any vertex $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(\exists \text{ a well separated path } \Gamma = (k_1, i_1), (k_2, i_2), \ldots, (k_\ell, i_\ell) \text{ from } x \text{ that is infected}\right)\\ &\leq \exp\left(-c\sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{\ell} 2^{k_j}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. For any j, since the path is infected we have $Q^{\text{enc}}_{k_j}(i_j) \subset I_{k_j}$. This gives that there exists $\tilde{i}_j$ such that $Q^{\text{core}}_{k_j}(\tilde{i}_j) \cap Q_{k_j}(i_j) \cap C_{k_j} \neq \emptyset$. From Lemma 5.5, we have that the event $\left\{Q^{\text{core}}_{k_j}(\tilde{i}_j) \cap C_{k_j} \neq \emptyset\right\}$ is measurable with respect to the passage times inside $Q^{\text{super}}_{k_j}(\tilde{i}_j) \subset Q^{\text{neigh}}_{k_j}(i_j)$. Also, the number of choices for $\tilde{i}_j$ is at most some constant c_1, depending only on d. Since $\{Q^{\text{neigh}}_{k_j}(i_j)\}_{j=1,\ldots,\ell}$ is a collection of disjoint sets, if we fix the path $\Gamma = (k_1, i_1), (k_2, i_2), \ldots, (k_\ell, i_\ell)$, and take the union bound over the choices of $\tilde{i}_1, \tilde{i}_2, \ldots, \tilde{i}_\ell$, we have from Lemma 5.7 that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\Gamma \text{ is an infected path}\right) \leq c_1^\ell \exp\left(-a\sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{\ell} 2^{k_j}\right),$$

where a can be made as large as we want by properly setting L_1 and p. It remains to bound the number of well separated paths that exist starting from x. Since $x \in Q^{\text{neigh2}}_{k_1}(i_1)$, the number of ways to choose the first cell is at most $\left(\frac{12}{5} C'_{\text{FPP}} R^{\text{outer}}_{k_1}\right)^d$. Consider a j such that $k_j > k_{j+1}$. We have that $Q^{\text{neigh2}}_{k_j}(i_j)$ must intersect $Q^{\text{neigh2}}_{k_{j+1}}(i_{j+1})$, which gives that

$$\begin{aligned}Q^{\text{core}}_{k_{j+1}}(i_{j+1}) &\subset i_j L_{k_j} + \mathcal{B}\left(\tfrac{6}{5} R^{\text{outer}}_{k_j} + \tfrac{6}{5} R^{\text{outer}}_{k_{j+1}} + R_{k_{j+1}}\right)\\ &\subset i_j L_{k_j} + \mathcal{B}\left(\tfrac{7}{5} R^{\text{outer}}_{k_j}\right)\\ &\subset i_j L_{k_j} + \left[-\tfrac{7C'_{\text{FPP}}}{5} R^{\text{outer}}_{k_j}, \tfrac{7C'_{\text{FPP}}}{5} R^{\text{outer}}_{k_j}\right]^d.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the number of ways to choose i_{j+1} given (k_j, i_j) and k_{j+1} is at most

$$\left(\frac{14C'_{\mathrm{FPP}}}{5}\frac{R^{\mathrm{outer}}_{k_j}}{L_{k_{j+1}}}\right)^d.$$

Therefore, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\exists \text{ a well separated path } \Gamma = (k_1, i_1), (k_2, i_2), \ldots, (k_\ell, i_\ell) \text{ from } x \text{ that is infected}\right)\\
&\leq c_1^\ell \left(\frac{12}{5}C'_{\mathrm{FPP}}R^{\mathrm{outer}}_{k_1}\right)^d \prod_{j=1}^{\ell}\left(\frac{14C'_{\mathrm{FPP}}}{5}\frac{R^{\mathrm{outer}}_{k_j}}{L_{k_{j+1}}}\right)^{2d}\exp\left(-a2^{k_j}\right)\\
&\leq c_1^\ell \prod_{j=1}^{\ell}\exp\left(c_2 k_j\log(k_j) - a2^{k_j}\right)\\
&\leq \prod_{j=1}^{\ell}\exp\left(-a2^{k_j-1}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows for some $c_2 = c_2(d, \alpha, \epsilon)$ by the value of R^{outer}_k from (11), and the last inequality follows by setting a large enough and such that $a \geq 2c$. □

For the lemma below, define the event

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{\kappa,r} = \{&\text{there exists a well separated path from the origin that is infected,}\\
&\text{has only cells of scale smaller than } \kappa, \text{ and has reach at least } C_{\mathrm{FPP}}r\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Let $E_{\infty,r}$ be the above event without the restriction that all scales must be smaller than κ.

Proposition 5.11. *Fix any positive constant c, any $r > 0$ and any time $t \geq 0$. We can set L_1 large enough and then p small enough, both depending only on c, α, d and ϵ, so that there exists a positive constant c' depending only on d for which*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_{\infty,r}\right) \leq \exp\left(-cr^{\frac{c'}{\log\log r}}\right).$$

Proof. Let A_r be the set of vertices of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ of distance at most $C_{\mathrm{FPP}}r$ from the origin. Set $\delta_r = \frac{1}{(d+3)\log\log r}$ and $\kappa = \delta_r \log r$. For any large enough a depending on L_1 and p, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\exists (k,i)\colon k \geq \kappa \text{ and } Q^{\mathrm{neigh2}}_k(i) \cap A_r \neq \emptyset \text{ and } Q^{\mathrm{core}}_k(i) \cap C_k \neq \emptyset\right)\\
&\leq \sum_{k=\kappa}^{\infty}\sum_{i\colon Q^{\mathrm{neigh2}}_k(i)\cap A_r \neq \emptyset} \mathbb{P}\left(Q^{\mathrm{core}}_k(i) \cap C_k \neq \emptyset\right)\\
&\leq \sum_{k=\kappa}^{\infty}\left(\frac{2C'_{\mathrm{FPP}}\left(r + \frac{6}{5}R^{\mathrm{outer}}_k + R_k\right)}{L_k}\right)^d \exp\left(-a2^k\right) \leq \sum_{k=\kappa}^{\infty}\exp\left(-a2^{k-1}\right) \leq 2\exp\left(-a2^{\kappa-1}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we use Lemma 5.7. If the event above does not happen, then Lemma 5.4 gives that $\eta^2(t) \cap A_r \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{\kappa-1} I_j$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_{\infty,r}\right) \leq 2\exp\left(-a2^{\kappa-1}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(E_{\kappa,r}\right).$$

Let Γ be a well separated path from the origin, with all cells of scale smaller than κ, and which has reach at least r. Define $m_k(\Gamma)$ to be the number of cells of scale k in Γ. Since Γ must contain at least one cell for which its Q^{neigh2} region is not contained in A_r, we have

$$C_{\text{FPP}} r \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\kappa-1} m_k(\Gamma) \frac{12}{5} R_k^{\text{outer}}.$$

Because of the type of bounds derived in Lemma 5.10, it will be convenient to rewrite the inequality above so that the term $\sum_{k=1}^{\kappa-1} 2^k$ appears. Note that we can set a constant c' such that $R_j^{\text{outer}} \leq c' 2^j (j!)^{d+2} L_1$ for all $j \geq 1$, which gives

$$C_{\text{FPP}} r \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\kappa-1} m_k(\Gamma) 2^k \frac{12c'(k!)^{d+2} L_1}{5} \leq \frac{12c'(\kappa!)^{d+2} L_1}{5} \sum_{k=1}^{\kappa-1} m_k(\Gamma) 2^k.$$

For any Γ, define $\varphi(\Gamma) = \sum_{k=1}^{\kappa-1} m_k(\Gamma) 2^k$. We can then split the sum over all paths according to the value of $\varphi(\Gamma)$ of the path. Using this, Lemma 5.10, and the fact that $\varphi(\Gamma) \geq \frac{5C_{\text{FPP}} r}{12c'(\kappa!)^{d+2} L_1}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(E_{\kappa,r}\right) \leq \sum_{m \geq \frac{5C_{\text{FPP}} r}{12c'(\kappa!)^{d+2} L_1}}^{\infty} \exp\left(-c'' m\right) A_m,$$

where A_m is the number of ways to fix ℓ and set $k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_\ell$ such that $\varphi(\Gamma) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} 2^{k_j} = m$, and c'' is the constant in Lemma 5.10. For each choice of $\ell, k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_\ell$, we can define a string from $\{0,1\}^m$ by taking 2^{k_1} consecutive 0s, 2^{k_2} consecutive 1s, 2^{k_3} consecutive 0s, and so on and so forth. Note that each string is mapped to at most one choice of $\ell, k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_\ell$. Therefore, $A_m \leq 2^m$, the number of strings in $\{0,1\}^m$. The proof is completed since c'' can be made arbitrarily large by setting L_1 large enough and then p small enough, and $\frac{5C_{\text{FPP}} r}{12c'(\kappa!)^{d+2} L_1} \geq \frac{5C_{\text{FPP}} r}{12c'\kappa^{(d+2)\kappa} L_1} \geq \frac{5C_{\text{FPP}} r^{\frac{1}{d+3}}}{12c' L_1}$. □

5.8 Completing the proof

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We start showing that η^1 grows indefinitely with positive probability. Let $e_1 = (1, 0, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Any set of vertices that separates the origin from infinity must contain a vertex of the form be_1 for some nonnegative integer b. For any b and $t \geq 0$, let

$$f_b(t) = \mathbb{P}\left(\eta^2(t) \text{ contains } be_1 \text{ and separates the origin from infinity}\right).$$

Recall that $\mathcal{B}(r) \subseteq [-C'_{\text{FPP}} r, C'_{\text{FPP}} r]^d$, which gives that $be_1 + \mathcal{B}\left(\frac{b}{2C'_{\text{FPP}}}\right)$ does not contain the origin. Hence, in order for a connected set containing be_1 to separate the origin from infinity, this set must contain at least a vertex of distance (according to the norm $|\cdot|$) greater than $\frac{b}{2C'_{\text{FPP}}}$ from be_1. Applying Proposition 5.11 we have

$$f_b(t) \leq \exp\left(-c\left(\frac{b}{2C'_{\text{FPP}}}\right)^{\frac{c'}{\log\log b}}\right).$$

Note that the constant c from Proposition 5.11 can be made arbitrarily large by setting L_1 and p properly. Therefore, $\sum_{b=0}^{\infty} f_b(t)$ can be made smaller than 1, which completes the proof since

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\eta^1 \text{ grows indefinitely}\right) \geq 1 - \limsup_{t \to \infty} \sum_{b=0}^{\infty} f_b(t).$$

Now we turn to the proof of positive speed of growth for η^1. Note that $\eta^1 \cup \eta^2$ is stochastically dominated by a first passage percolation process where the passage times are i.i.d. exponential random variables of rate $1+\lambda$, because the minimum between two independent exponential random variables of rates r_1 and r_2 is itself an exponential random variable of rate $r_1 + r_2$. Then, by the shape theorem we have that there exists a constant $c > 0$ large enough such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\eta^1(t) \cup \eta^2(t) \subset [-ct, ct]^d\right) \to 1 \quad \text{as } t \to \infty.$$

Now fix any t, take c as above, and set $\kappa = 1 + \frac{\log t}{(\log\log t)^2}$. For any large enough a depending on L_1 and p, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\exists (k,i)\colon k \geq \kappa \text{ and } Q_k^{\text{neigh2}}(i) \cap [-ct,ct]^d \neq \emptyset \text{ and } Q_k^{\text{core}}(i) \cap C_k \neq \emptyset\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=\kappa}^{\infty} \sum_{i\colon Q_k^{\text{neigh2}}(i) \cap [-ct,ct]^d \neq \emptyset} \mathbb{P}\left(Q_k^{\text{core}}(i) \cap C_k \neq \emptyset\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=\kappa}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2C'_{\text{FPP}}\left(ct + \frac{6}{5}R_k^{\text{outer}} + R_k\right)}{L_k}\right)^d \exp\left(-a2^k\right) \leq \sum_{k=\kappa}^{\infty} \exp\left(-a2^{k-1}\right) \leq 2\exp\left(-a2^{\kappa-1}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we use Lemma 5.7. The above derivation allows us to restrict to cells of scale smaller than κ. Note that since there are no contagious set of scale κ or larger intersecting $[-ct, ct]^d$, the spread of $\eta^1(t)$ inside $[-ct, ct]^d$ stochastically dominates a first passage percolation process of rate λ_κ^1. Thus, disregarding regions taken by η^2, we can set a sufficiently small constant $c' > 0$ so that, at time t, $\bar{\eta}^1$ will contain a ball of radius $2c't$ around the origin with probability at least $1 - \exp\left(-c''t^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right)$ for some constant c'', by Proposition 3.1. The only caveat is that, at time t, there may be regions of scale smaller than κ that are taken by η^2 and intersects the boundary of $\mathcal{B}(2c't)$. If we show that such regions cannot intersect $\partial^{\text{i}}\mathcal{B}(c't)$, then we have that the probability that η^1 survives up to time t but $\bar{\eta}^1(t)$ does not contain a ball of radius $c't$ around the origin is at most $1 - 2\exp\left(-a2^{\kappa-1}\right) - \exp\left(-c''t^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right)$. This is indeed the case, since we can take a constant c''' such that any cell of scale smaller than κ has diameter at most

$$c'''(\kappa!)^{d+2} \leq c''' \exp\left((d+2)\kappa\log\kappa\right) \leq c''' \exp\left(2(d+2)\frac{\log t}{\log\log t}\right) < c't,$$

where the inequalities above hold for all large enough t, completing the proof. □

6 From MDLA to FPPHE

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We start by giving a different construction of MDLA. The aggregate starts from the origin. Each vertex of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ will either be occupied by the aggregate, be occupied by a special type of particle that we will call *hole*, or be unoccupied. Each vertex of $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ is initially unoccupied, and is assigned a non-negative integer value, which are given by independent random variables having value $i \geq 0$ with probability $(1-\mu)^i\mu$. Each edge at the boundary of the aggregate is selected at rate 1. Whenever an edge (x, y) is selected, where x belongs to the aggregate and y does not, three possibilities may arise. If y is unoccupied and the value of y is 0, then the aggregate occupies y. If y is unoccupied and the value of y is $i \geq 1$, then the value of y is changed to $i - 1$,

a particle called a *hole* is born at y, the aggregate does not occupy y, and the process continues. If y is occupied (necessarily by a hole), then nothing happens and the process continues. Holes perform continuous time, simple symmetric random walks, independent of the values of the vertices, and obeying the exclusion rule; that is, whenever a hole attempts to jump onto a vertex already occupied by a hole or by the aggregate, the jump is suppressed.

We now show that the above process is equivalent to MDLA. In the definition of MDLA from Section 1, we can discover the holes as the process advances. For this, we can say that each vertex of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ can be in either of three states: 0 meaning *unknown*, 1 meaning that the vertex belongs to the aggregate, and 2 meaning that the vertex contains a hole (i.e., it is a vertex without a particle). Initially, the origin of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ has state 1 and all other vertices have state 0. Then, the aggregate advances at rate 1, like a first passage percolation process. Whenever the aggregate attempts to occupy a vertex, if the current state of the vertex is 0, then with probability μ the aggregate succeeds to occupy the vertex, which turns to state 1. Otherwise, the state of the vertex changes from 0 to 2, and the attempt of the aggregate fails. If the current state of the vertex was not 0, then nothing happens. Once a hole is discovered (i.e., once a vertex of state 0 turns to state 2), the hole moves as a continuous-time, simple symmetric random walk on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ obeying the exclusion rule. The above process corresponds exactly to the definition of MDLA, as presented in section 1. This is equivalent to the construction we gave above since we do not need to keep track of vertices of state 0, as they are the ones not belonging to holes or the aggregate. The value of each vertex in the construction gives the number of times the aggregate will encounter a hole in that vertex when trying to occupy a vertex of state 0.

We now couple MDLA with FPPHE. First, each type 2 seed of FPPHE is present in a vertex of $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ with value at least 1. Hence, $p = 1 - \mu$. Now we will describe how to couple the evolution of holes of MDLA with first passage percolation where passage times are independent exponential random variables of parameter $\lambda = 1 - \frac{1}{4d-1}$. As described in Section 1, holes in MDLA get a small drift whenever they are neighboring the aggregate. However, regardless of the location of a hole, if the hole jumps from a vertex x to y, with positive probability the hole jumps back to x before the aggregate can occupy x. We can this a backtracking jump. In fact, even if the aggregate was at a neighbor of x before the hole jumped to y, with probability at least $\frac{1}{4d-1} = 1 - \lambda$ the hole jumps back to x before the aggregate attempts to occupy x. Note that $4d - 1$ is the number of edges that are incident to either x or y. We use this backtracking jumps to guarantee that even though the motion of holes are intricate to control, holes cannot move with the same velocity as a first passage percolation of rate 1.

Before defining the coupling explicitly, we mention the following recursive construction of an exponential random variable of rate 1. Fix any positive integer K. Let X be a Bernoulli random variable of parameter $1 - 1/K$, let Y be an exponential random variable of rate K, and let Z be an exponential random variable of parameter 1, where X, Y and Z are independent of one another. Hence,

$$Y + \mathbf{1}(X = 1) Z \text{ is an exponential random variable of rate 1.} \tag{33}$$

The above can be checked by comparing moment generating functions, but another reason why (33) holds is the following. Let W be the variable defined in (33). Note that Y is distributed as the minimum of K independent exponential random variables of rate 1. If W is one of these K random variables, then with probability $1/K$, we have that W is the variable that achieves the minimum, so it has value Y. With probability $1 - 1/K$, W is not the minimum and has value at least Y. Given this and the value of Y, the memoryless property of exponential random variables gives that $W - Y$ is again an independent exponential random variable of rate 1. This is given by Z, concluding the

proof of (33).

The usefulness of (33) for us lies on the fact that it can be applied inductively to define Z. If $X = 1$, choose K_2, X_2, Y_2 and Z_2 as before, and set $Z = Y_2 + \mathbf{1}(X_2 = 1)\, Z_2$. This can be iterated for any sequence of values $K_2, K_3, \ldots$ until we find an i for which $X_i = 0$.

Another useful fact about exponential random variables is that if $Z_1, Z_2, \ldots$ are independent exponential random variables of rate 1, and K is a geometric random variable of mean $1/q$, then

$$Z_1 + Z_2 + \cdots + Z_K \text{ is an exponential random variable of rate } q. \tag{34}$$

Now we turn to the coupling between the motion of holes of MDLA and the growth of η^2 in FPPHE. We will construct the coupling dynamically as MDLA evolves, meaning that as the holes move, we will specify the passage times used by η^2. Some passage times may end up not being specified, for example when no hole visits the endpoints of an edge. The passage times that are not specified in the procedure above will not be important; for consistency we can set them later to be independent exponential random variables of rate λ. We will denote by $\upsilon(t)$ a subset of vertices and edges, starting with $\upsilon(0) = \emptyset$. We will also keep another subset of edges $\bar{\upsilon}(t)$. At any time t, $\upsilon(t)$ will contain the edges for which we are done with because we have already computed the passage time of η^2 through them; $\upsilon(t)$ will in fact be comprised of these edges and their endpoints. We would like to say that holes are all contained in $\upsilon(t)$, but this will not be possible since holes at the internal boundary of υ crosses edges outside of $\upsilon(t)$ at rate 1. When this happens we will add the crossed edge to $\bar{\upsilon}(t)$ and will wait the next steps to see which action to take with this edge. Hence, we use $\bar{\upsilon}(t)$ to denote the edges adjacent to holes and which can be used by these holes to perform a backtracking step as described above. These are the more troublesome edges: they are the edges that caused the holes to leave υ and whose passage times have not completely been computed. The edges of $\bar{\upsilon}(t)$ will be denoted by *backtracking edges*. During the coupling procedure, we will keep variables $T_{x,y}$ for each edge (x, y). Initially we set $T_{x,y} = 0$ for all edges (x, y), and at the end $T_{x,y}$ will give the passage time through (x, y).

Let $\upsilon^s(t), \bar{\upsilon}^s(t)$ be the set of vertices of $\upsilon(t)$ and the set of endpoints of $\bar{\upsilon}(t)$, respectively. The procedure starts when the first hole is born, say at some vertex x and time t. At this time, we add x to $\upsilon(t)$. For any time t, let

$$\begin{aligned} &H_t \text{ be the set of vertices containing holes, and} \\ &H'_t = H_t \setminus \upsilon^s(t) \text{ be the holes that are outside of } \upsilon(t). \end{aligned}$$

Let K_t be the set of edges over which a hole can jump (i.e., incident to a hole and to an unoccupied vertex) plus the edges incident to $(\bar{\upsilon}^s(t) \cap \upsilon^s(t)) \setminus H_t$ whose other endpoint is occupied by a hole or the aggregate. The edges incident to $(\bar{\upsilon}^s(t) \cap \upsilon^s(t)) \setminus H_t$ corresponds to the case where a hole is at a vertex $x \notin \upsilon(t)$ and the last edge it crossed is $(x, y) \in \bar{\upsilon}(t)$; so $y \in (\bar{\upsilon}^s(t) \cap \upsilon^s(t)) \setminus H_t$. The hole can use (x, y) to backtrack to y, so we added to K_t all edges incident to y from which the aggregate or another hole could jump to y, preventing the backtracking move of the hole at x. Define Y_t as an exponential random variable of rate $|K_t|$, and E_t as a uniformly random edge of K_t. For conciseness, let $\succeq$ denote stochastic domination, and $\mathrm{Exp}(x)$ denote an independent exponential random variable of rate x. We consider that each edge of the lattice has a Poisson clock of rate 1 (that is, is associated with a Poisson process of rate 1) so that, whenever the clock rings (that is, at the times given by its Poisson process), then if one of the endpoints is occupied by the aggregate or a hole, the aggregate or the hole attempts to occupy or jump to the other endpoint. Then Y_t is the time we need to wait until an edge of K_t rings, and E_t is the edge of K_t that rings first.

Our coupling procedure will establish the following properties:

(i) all holes are contained in $\upsilon^s(t) \cup \partial^{\mathrm{o}}\upsilon^s(t)$,
(ii) $\forall t \geq 0$, if there is a hole at $x \in H'_t$, then there is exactly one edge of $\bar{\upsilon}(t)$ incident to x,
(iii) $\forall t \geq 0$, edges of $\bar{\upsilon}(t)$ have no common endpoint,
(iv) $\forall (x,y) \in \bar{\upsilon}(t)$, the hole is at $x \notin \upsilon(t)$, y is in $\upsilon(t)$ and is unoccupied, and no edge adjacent to x or y has rang since the hole jumped from y to x,
(v) $\forall (x,y) \in \upsilon(t)$, $T_{x,y} \succeq \mathrm{Exp}(\lambda)$,
(vi) $\forall (x,y) \in \bar{\upsilon}(t)$, $T_{x,y} \succeq$ a sum of independent exponential random variables of rate 1,
(vii) $\forall t \geq 0$, we have $\eta^2(t) \supseteq \upsilon^s(t)$. (35)

Note that when the first hole is discovered, then (35) is satisfied since υ and η^2 only contain the vertex of that hole, $\bar{\upsilon} = \emptyset$ and $T_{x,y} = 0$ for all edge (x,y). It suffices to show that (35) holds at all times, since then properties (i,vii) guarantee that the holes are always contained in η^2 or its boundary. Assume that (35) holds at some time t, and let $s = Y_t$. Then $t+s$ is the time at which the first edge in K_t rings, and no hole jumped during $(t, t+s)$. Several cases may arise, but regardless of the case we do the following:

$$\text{for each edge } (w,w') \in K_t \setminus \upsilon(t), \text{ we add } s \text{ to } T_{w,w'}. \tag{36}$$

Before describing each case, we give an overall explanation of the construction of the passage times. For illustration, assume that t is the first time that a hole is discovered. Let x be the vertex at which this hole is discovered and (x,y) be an edge adjacent to that hole. Our procedure will wait time s until the first edge adjacent to x rings. At this time, (36) gives that we add s to $T_{x,y}$. Note that if (x,y) is not the edge that rang, then adding s to $T_{x,y}$ corresponds to the construction of an Exp(1) random variable as in (33) with $X = 1$. So the construction of that random variable has not yet finished. At the moment (x,y) rings for the first time, we have applied (33) with $X = 0$, completing the construction. Thus, we will have that $T_{x,y}$ is distributed as Exp(1). But we will not be done yet with (x,y), because the edge could still be used for a backtracking jump. Each backtracking jump succeeds with probability at least $\frac{1}{4d-1}$. If a backtracking jump is performed, we will still not be done with edge (x,y). We will wait until the next time (x,y) rings; recall that at that point we have added to $T_{x,y}$ another independent exponential random variable of rate 1, giving that $T_{x,y}$ now stochastically dominates the sum of two independent exponential random variables of rate 1. Then, at the moment we finally decide that (x,y) will not be used for a backtracking jump, we obtain that $T_{x,y}$ stochastically dominates the sum of k exponential random variables of rate 1, where $k-1$ is the number of backtracking jumps performed through (x,y). Since k is a geometric random variable of mean $\left(1 - \frac{1}{4d-1}\right)^{-1} = \lambda^{-1}$ we have via (34) that $T_{x,y}$ stochastically dominates $\mathrm{Exp}(\lambda)$.

Now we turn to the case analysis. During the discussion of each case, the properties in (35) will remain all valid, and we will highlight only the ones that are not immediate to check. We will also see that, at each step, we only declare an edge to have its passage time completed, thereby moving it to the set υ, if the edge belongs to $\bar{\upsilon}(t)$. Assume that (35) holds at some time t. Let $s = Y_t$ and $E_t = (x,y)$ be the edge that rang at time $t+s$. Refer to Figure 10.

Case 1: x hosts a hole and y is unoccupied.
Case 1.1: $x \in \upsilon(t)$ and $y \notin \upsilon(t)$. The hole jumps from x to y, leaving $\upsilon(t)$. After doing (36), we



Figure 10: Illustration of the case analysis. Black balls represent vertices occupied by a hole, gray balls represent vertices occupied by a hole or the aggregate, dashed edges represent edges of $\bar{\upsilon}$, arrows represent the jump under consideration, and the parabola represents the boundary between $\upsilon(t)$ and its complement. In case 2, vertex y can be either inside or outside of $\upsilon(t)$.

have that $T_{x,y} \succeq \text{Exp}(1)$ as explained above. Then we add (x, y) to $\bar{\upsilon}$ since the hole may use (x, y) to backtrack to x in later steps. Note that (iii) in (35) remains valid. This is true because x could not have been the endpoint of an edge in $\bar{\upsilon}(t)$ by (iv) in (35), and y could not be the endpoint of an edge in $\bar{\upsilon}(t)$ either, otherwise y must host a hole by (iv) in (35).

Case 1.2: $x \notin \upsilon(t)$, $(x, y) \in \bar{\upsilon}(t)$. (Note that (iv) in (35) implies that $y \in \upsilon(t)$.)
The previous jump of the hole was from y to x, when from case 1.1 the edge (x, y) was added to $\bar{\upsilon}$. From (iv) in (35) no edge adjacent to y has rang since that time. So y remained unoccupied since the time when the hole jumped from y to x. Now the hole decided to jump back to y. This means that we are not yet done with computing $T_{x,y}$. We simply remove (x, y) from $\bar{\upsilon}$.

Case 1.3: $x \notin \upsilon(t)$, $y \notin \upsilon(t)$.
This implies that $(x, y) \notin \bar{\upsilon}(t)$, and (ii) in (35) gives that there is a $z \in \upsilon(t)$ so that $(x, z) \in \bar{\upsilon}(t)$. In other words, the hole reached x from (x, z). Case 1.2 covered the case of a backtrack jump from x, while here we handle the case where the hole decides to jump further to y. Then, at this moment, we are done with $T_{x,z}$: we remove it from $\bar{\upsilon}$ and add it to υ. We also add x to υ. As described before, at this moment we have $T_{x,z} \succeq \text{Exp}(\lambda)$. Now we need to handle the edge (x, y), so we add it to $\bar{\upsilon}$. Note that, by the construction in (33), performing (36) makes $T_{x,y} \succeq \text{Exp}(1)$. Note that y could not have been an endpoint in $\bar{\upsilon}(t)$ since otherwise it would have to host a hole by (iv) in (35). Consequently, (iii) in (35) remains valid.

Case 1.4: $x \notin \upsilon(t)$ and $y \in \upsilon(t)$ with $(x, y) \notin \bar{\upsilon}$. This implies that there is a $z \in \upsilon(t)$ so that $(x, z) \in \bar{\upsilon}(t)$; that is, the hole reached x from (x, z). Then the hole jumps back to υ, but without using the backtracking edge (x, z). Since the hole is not anymore outside υ, we can remove (x, z) from $\bar{\upsilon}$. Since the hole did not do a backtracking jump, we could declare that we are done with $T_{x,z}$, but we will only do that if y is not an endpoint of an edge in $\bar{\upsilon}(t)$. The other case, which will be further explained in case 2, does not create any problem in the computation of $T_{x,z}$, since the hole is back to υ and the computation of $T_{x,z}$ can continue the next time the edge belongs to the set K_t.

Case 1.5: $x \in \upsilon(t)$, $y \in \upsilon(t)$. We do not need to do anything in this case, since the hole is traversing

an edge whose endpoints have already been added to υ. This is true even if (x, y) itself is not in υ, since if η^2 reaches both x and y before traversing (x, y), then the actual passage time from x to y is irrelevant for the future evolution of η^2. The only exception is when y neighbors a vertex $w \in \bar{\upsilon}^s(t)$, but this effect will be handled in case 2.

Case 2: $x \in \upsilon(t)$, is unoccupied, and there is a vertex $z \neq y$ such that $(x, z) \in \bar{\upsilon}(t)$.
Note that we do not specify whether y has a hole or not, or whether y is in υ or not (in Figure 10 we illustrate the case of $y \notin \upsilon$, but the other case is similar). If y does have a hole, the motion of y and its effect on the edges adjacent to y are covered by case 1. Here we see the effect of the choice of (x, y) in the edge $(x, z) \in \bar{\upsilon}$. Note that since $x \in \upsilon(t)$, we have that there is a hole at z. The clock of (x, y) ringing means that the vertex x can be occupied before the hole at z tries to backtrack to x. Therefore, we remove (x, z) from $\bar{\upsilon}$, and add (x, z) and z to υ, concluding the computation of $T_{x,z} \succeq \text{Exp}(\lambda)$. Note that (iii) of (35) guarantees that (x, y) cannot be a backtracking edge. However, it could still be the case that there exists a vertex w such that $(w, y) \in \bar{\upsilon}(t)$; this is illustrated in Figure 10. This corresponds also to the situation in case 1.4. Note that applying the steps described in case 1.4 to the present situation gives that we do not declare the computation of $T_{y,w}$ as completed. This is important because at this step we must declare that the computation of $T_{x,z}$ is completed, as (x, z) cannot be used for a backtrack jump for the hole at z. If we allow two backtrack edges to have their passage times completed at the same step, then their passage times would not be independent. However, by the way we construct the cases, we see that the choice of E_t determines exactly which backtracking edge will have its passage time completed, allowing us to apply the thinning property of Poisson random variables in the construction described in (34).

Note that the cases above cover all possibilities for the edge (x, y), and preserve the properties in (35). Therefore, we have that the holes are contained in $\eta^2 \cup \partial^o \eta^2$ at all times, as required. Since by the construction of MDLA given in the beginning of the proof we have that the aggregate evolves as a first passage percolation process of rate 1, but blocked by holes that belong to η^2, we obtain that the aggregate contains η^1. Then the proof of Theorem 1.1 is completed by applying Theorem 1.2. □

References

[1] M.T. Barlow. Fractals, and diffusion-limited aggregation. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 117(1):161–169, 1993.

[2] M.T. Barlow, R. Pemantle, and E.A. Perkins. Diffusion-limited aggregation on a tree. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 107(1):1–60, 1997.

[3] F. Barra, B. Davidovitch, A. Levermann, and I. Procaccia. Laplacian growth and diffusion limited aggregation: different universality classes. *Physical Review Letters*, 87(13):134501, 2001.

[4] I. Benjamini and A. Yadin. Diffusion limited aggregation on a cylinder. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 279(1):187–223, 2008.

[5] L. Carleson and N. Makarov. Aggregation in the plane and Loewner's equation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 216(3):583–607, 2001.

[6] L. Chayes and G. Swindle. Hydrodynamic limits for one-dimensional particle systems with moving boundaries. *Ann. Probab.*, 24(2):559–598, 1996.

[7] J.T. Cox and R. Durrett. Some limit theorems for percolation processes with necessary and sufficient conditions. *Ann. Probab.*, 9(4):583–603, 1981.

[8] R. Eldan. Diffusion-limited aggregation on the hyperbolic plane. *Ann. Probab.*, 43(4):2084–2118, 2015.

[9] O. Häggström and R. Pemantle. Absence of mutual unbounded growth for almost all parameter values in the two-type Richardson model. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 90(2):207–222, 2000.

[10] M.B. Hastings and L.S. Levitov. Laplacian growth as one-dimensional turbulence. *Physica D*, 116:244–252, 1998.

[11] T.A. Witten Jr. and L.M. Sander. Diffusion-limited aggregation, a kinetic critical phenomenon. *Physical Review Letters*, 47(19):1400–1403, 1981.

[12] K. Kassner. *Pattern formation in diffusion-limited crystal growth.* World Scientific, 1996.

[13] H. Kesten. How long are the arms in DLA? *J. Phys. A*, 20(1):L29–L33, 1987.

[14] H. Kesten. Upper bounds for the growth rate of DLA. *Phys. A*, 168(1):529–535, 1990.

[15] H. Kesten. On the speed of convergence in first-passage percolation. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 3(2):296–338, 1993.

[16] H. Kesten and V. Sidoravicius. Positive recurrence of a one-dimensional variant of diffusion limited aggregation. In *In and out of equilibrium. 2*, volume 60 of *Progr. Probab.*, pages 429–461. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2008.

[17] H. Kesten and V. Sidoravicius. A problem in one-dimensional diffusion-limited aggregation (DLA) and positive recurrence of Markov chains. *Ann. Probab.*, 36(5):1838–1879, 2008.

[18] S. Martineau. Directed diffusion-limited aggregation. 2014. Available at arXiv:1411.3667v2.

[19] D. Richardson. Random growth in a tessellation. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 74:515–528, 1973.

[20] H. Rosenstock and C. Marquardt. Cluster formation in two-dimensional random walks: application to photolysis of silver halides. *Physical Review B*, 22(12):5797–5809, 1980.

[21] P.G. Saffman and G.I. Taylor. The penetration of a fluid into a porous medium or hele-shaw cell containing a more viscous liquid. *Proceedings of the Royal Society London A*, 245:312–329, 1958.

[22] R. Voss. Multiparticle fractal aggregation. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 36(5/6):861–872, 1984.

A Proof of Proposition 4.1

We start describing the overall strategy of the proof, and setting up the notation. The main intuition behind the proof is that since $\xi^2(0)$ is initially inside $\mathcal{B}(R)$ and $\xi^1(0)$ is outside $\mathcal{B}(\alpha R)$, with $\alpha > 1$ being large enough, there is enough space for ξ^1 to start growing before noticing the presence of ξ^2. This gives enough time for ξ^1 and ξ^2 to get closer to the set predicted by the shape



Figure 11: A schematic view of the encapsulation procedure. The left picture shows the ball $\mathcal{B}(r)$ that contains $\xi^2(0)$, and we assume that $\xi^1(0)$ is at the boundary of $\mathcal{B}(\alpha r)$. The proof goes by establishing that ξ^1 occupies the regions illustrated in black, while ξ^2 is contained in the yellow regions. The growing sequence of annulus sectors that are occupied by ξ^1 grows until it reaches a full annulus, as illustrated in the rightmost picture. At this moment, ξ^2 has been encapsulated and is confined inside $\mathcal{B}\left(\frac{10R}{11-\lambda}\right)$.

theorem. Then we can guarantee that ξ^1 can encapsulate ξ^2 by letting ξ^1 occupy a sequence of growing annulus sectors centered at the origin. This is illustrated in Figure 11.

We now turn to the details of the construction of the annulus sectors. Set

$$\delta = \frac{1-\lambda}{10}.$$

Note that $\delta \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^{1/10}} - 1 \wedge \frac{1}{10}$. Define

$$C_0 = \{x/|x|\} \quad \text{and} \quad C_n = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d \colon |y| = 1 \text{ and } \inf_{z \in C_{n-1}} |y - z| \leq \delta^2 \right\} \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$

The value of C_n is related to the angle of the annulus sector at step n, which starts from the angle related to position x and increases until C_n is the full unit circle, according to the norm $|\cdot|$. Let N be the step where we obtain the unit circle; i.e., N is the smallest integer so that $C_N = C_{N+1}$. Note that

$$d_H(C_n, C_{n-1}) \leq \delta^2,$$

where d_H stands for the Hausdorff distance. Let

$$A_0^1 = \{x\} \quad \text{and} \quad A_n^1 = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d \colon (1+\delta)^{n-1} \alpha r < |y| \leq (1+\delta)^n \alpha r \text{ and } \tfrac{y}{|y|} \in C_n \right\} \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$

The goal is to show that, for each $n = 1, 2, \ldots, N$, ξ^1 completely occupies A_n^1 after step n. Hence ξ^1 will encapsulate ξ^2 when it occupies A_N^1.

In order to show that ξ^1 occupies A_n^1 for all n, we need to bound the distance between A_n^1 and A_{n-1}^1. We have, for all $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{y \in A_n^1, z \in A_{n-1}^1} |y - z| &\leq (1+\delta)^{n-1} \alpha r d_H(C_{n-1}, C_n) + \left((1+\delta)^n - (1+\delta)^{n-1}\right) \alpha r \\ &= (1+\delta)^{n-1} \alpha r \left(d_H(C_{n-1}, C_n) + \delta\right) \\ &\leq (1+\delta)^n \delta \alpha r. \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

This leads us to define

$$t_n = (1+\delta)^{n+1}\delta\alpha r \quad \text{and} \quad T_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} t_n = \left(1-(1+\delta)^{-n}\right)(1+\delta)^{n+2}\alpha r.$$

The value t_n represents the time we will wait so that ξ^1 grows from A^1_{n-1} until it contains A^1_n. For all $n \geq 1$, define also the sets

$$\widehat{A}^1_n = \left\{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d \colon \exists y \in A^1_{n-1} \text{ and } z \sim x \text{ for which } |z-y| \leq (1+\delta)t_n\right\} \supset A^1_{n-1} \cup A^1_n$$

and

$$A^2_n = \mathcal{B}\left(r + (1+\delta)\lambda T_n\right).$$

Note that the distance between A^1_{n-1} and $\partial^{\mathrm{i}}\widehat{A}^1_n$ is at least $(1+\delta)t_n$.

The idea is that after occupying A^1_{n-1}, ξ^1 will occupy A^1_n after a time interval of length t_n, and this is achieved only using passage times inside $\widehat{A}^1_n$. At the same time, for each n, after time T_n, ξ^2 will be contained inside A^2_n. The crucial part of the construction is that $\widehat{A}^1_n \cap A^2_n = \emptyset$. This means that the passage times inside $\widehat{A}^1_n$ that we use to guarantee that ξ^1 grows from A^1_{n-1} to A^1_n do not intersect ξ^2.

A.1 The spread of ξ^2

In this part we show that the growth of ξ^2 is not too fast, so that ξ^2 is contained inside A^2_n.

Lemma A.1. *There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that, for any $n \geq 1$, we have*

$$\mathbb{Q}_{x,\mathcal{B}(r)}\left(\xi^2(T_n) \not\subseteq A^2_n\right) \leq \exp\left(-c(\lambda T_n)^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right).$$

Proof. By time scaling, we have that

$$\mathbb{Q}_{x,\mathcal{B}(r)}\left(\xi^2(T_n) \not\subseteq A^2_n\right) \leq \mathbb{Q}\left(D(\mathcal{B}(r), \partial^{\mathrm{o}} A^2_n; \zeta) \leq \lambda T_n\right) \leq \sum_{x \in \mathcal{B}(r)} \mathbb{Q}\left(D(x, \partial^{\mathrm{o}} A^2_n; \zeta) \leq \lambda T_n\right).$$

Since $\delta \geq (\lambda T_1)^{-\frac{1}{2d+4}} \geq (\lambda T_n)^{-\frac{1}{2d+4}}$, we can apply Proposition 3.1. Then using that for any $x \in \mathcal{B}(r)$ and $y \in \partial^{\mathrm{o}} A^2_n$ we have $|x-y| \geq (1+\delta)\lambda T_n$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{Q}\left(D(x, \partial^{\mathrm{o}} A^2_n; \zeta) \leq \lambda T_n\right) \leq \mathbb{Q}\left(S^{\delta}_{\lambda T_n}(\zeta)\right) \leq \exp\left(-c(\lambda T_n)^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right). \tag{38}$$

Since the number of vertices in $\mathcal{B}(r)$ is of order r^d, the lemma follows. □

A.2 The spread of ξ^1

Here we show that the growth of ξ^1 is fast enough, so that ξ^1 occupies A^1_n at time T_n.

Lemma A.2. *There exists a positive constant c such that, for any $n \geq 1$, we have*

$$\mathbb{Q}_{x,\mathcal{B}(r)}\left(\sup_{x \in A^1_n} D(A^1_{n-1}, x; \zeta^1) > t_n\right) \leq \exp\left(-ct_n^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right).$$

Proof. We start writing

$$\mathbb{Q}_{x,\mathcal{B}(r)}\left(\sup_{x\in A_n^1} D(A_{n-1}^1, x; \zeta^1) > t_n\right) \leq \sum_{x\in A_n^1} \mathbb{Q}\left(D(A_{n-1}^1, x; \zeta) > t_n\right).$$

From (37) we have that

$$\max_{x\in A_n^1, y\in A_{n-1}^1} |x-y| \leq \frac{t_n}{1+\delta} = t_n\left(1 - \frac{\delta}{1+\delta}\right).$$

Applying Proposition 3.1 and using that the number of vertices in A_n^1 is bounded above by $c'(1+\delta)^{n-1}\delta\alpha r$, we have

$$\mathbb{Q}_{x,\mathcal{B}(r)}\left(\sup_{x\in A_n^1} D(A_{n-1}^1, x; \zeta^1) > t_n\right) \leq \sum_{x\in A_n^1} \mathbb{Q}\left(S_{t_n}^{\frac{\delta}{1+\delta}}\right) \leq c'(1+\delta)^{n-1}\delta\alpha r t_n^d \exp\left(-c'' t_n^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right).$$

□

The lemma below gives that it is unlikely that ξ^1 leaves the set $\widehat{A}_n^1$ in the nth step. It may sound a bit counterintuitive that we need to guarantee that ξ^1 is not too fast, but this lemma is required to assure that ξ^1 occupies A_n^1 regardless of the passage times outside $\widehat{A}_n^1$.

Lemma A.3. *There is a positive constant c such that, for any $n \geq 1$, we have*

$$\mathbb{Q}_{x,\mathcal{B}(r)}\left(D(A_{n-1}^1, \partial^{\mathrm{i}}\widehat{A}_n^1; \zeta^1) \leq t_n\right) \leq \exp\left(-ct_n^{\frac{2d+3}{2d+4}}\right).$$

Proof. Recall that for any $x \in A_{n-1}^1$ and $y \in \partial^{\mathrm{i}}\widehat{A}_n^1$, we have

$$|x-y| \geq (1+\delta)t_n.$$

Then, since the number of vertices in A_{n-1}^1 can be bounded above by $c'(1+\delta)^{n-2}\alpha r$ for some constant $c' > 0$, applying Proposition 3.1 we obtain

$$\mathbb{Q}_{x,\mathcal{B}(r)}\left(D(A_{n-1}^1, \partial^{\mathrm{i}}\widehat{A}_n^1; \zeta^1) \leq t_n\right) \leq \sum_{x\in A_{n-1}^1} \mathbb{Q}\left(S_{t_n}^{\delta}\right) \leq c'(1+\delta)^{n-2}\alpha r t_n^{2d} \exp\left(-c'' t_n^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right).$$

□

A.3 Completing the Proof of Proposition 4.1

Proof of Proposition 4.1. For any $X \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, let $\zeta^1|_X$ be a set of passage times to the edges of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ such that they are equal to ζ^1 for any edge whose both endpoints belong to X and are equal to infinity everywhere else. For each integer n, define the events

$$E_n^{(1)} = \left\{D(\mathcal{B}(r), \partial^{\mathrm{o}} A_n^2; \zeta^2) \leq T_n\right\}, \quad E_n^{(2)} = \left\{\sup\nolimits_{x\in A_n^1} D\left(A_{n-1}^1, x; \zeta^1|_{\widehat{A}_n^1}\right) > t_n\right\}$$
$$\text{and} \quad E_n = E_n^{(1)} \cup E_n^{(2)}.$$

We define the event F in the proposition by $F = \bigcap_{n=1}^{N} E_n^{\mathrm{c}}$. We also define $R = (1+\delta)^N \alpha r$ and $T = T_N$. By Lemmas A.1, A.2 and A.3, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(F^{\mathrm{c}}\right) \leq \sum_{n \geq 1} \exp\left(-c(\lambda t_n)^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right) \leq 2\exp\left(-c(\lambda t_1)^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right) \leq \exp\left(-c'(\lambda(1-\lambda)\alpha r)^{\frac{d+1}{2d+4}}\right),$$

where the last inequality follows since $\lambda t_1 = (1+\delta)^2 \lambda \delta \alpha r$. This establishes the bound in the probability appearing in Proposition 4.1.

Since $E_n^{(1)}$ is measurable with respect to A_n^2 and $E_n^{(2)}$ is measurable with respect to $\widehat{A}_n^1$, we have that F is measurable with respect to the passage times inside

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^{N} \left(\widehat{A}_n^1 \cup A_n^2\right) \subset \mathcal{B}\left((1+\delta)^{N+2}\alpha r\right) = \mathcal{B}\left(\left(\frac{11-\lambda}{10}\right)^2 (1+\delta)^N \alpha r\right) = \mathcal{B}\left(\left(\frac{11-\lambda}{10}\right)^2 R\right).$$

Note that F is increasing with respect to ζ^2 and decreasing with respect to $\zeta^1|_{\mathcal{B}\left(\left(\frac{11-\lambda}{10}\right)^2 R\right)}$.

To conclude the proof of the proposition, it suffices to show that F implies that ξ^1 occupies all vertices in $\bigcup_{n=1}^{N} A_n^1$, since

$$A_N^1 = \mathcal{B}(R) \setminus \mathcal{B}\left(\frac{R}{1+\delta}\right) = \mathcal{B}(R) \setminus \mathcal{B}\left(\frac{10R}{11-\lambda}\right).$$

We will use induction on n to establish a stronger result by showing that, for each n, given that $\xi^1(T_{n-1}) \supset A_{n-1}^1$, the event E_n^{c} implies that $\xi^1(T_n) \supset A_n^1$. First, for $n = 0$ we have from the initial condition that $\xi^1(0) \supset A_0^1$. Now assume that $\xi^1(T_{n-1}) \supset A_{n-1}^1$. Since $E_n^{(1)}$ does not hold, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\xi^2(T_n) \subset A_n^2 = \mathcal{B}\left(r + (1+\delta)\lambda T_n\right) \subset \mathcal{B}\left(r + (1+\delta)^{n+3}\lambda\alpha r\right) &\subset \mathcal{B}\left(r + (1+\delta)^{n-7}\alpha r\right) \\ &\subset \mathcal{B}\left((1+\delta)^{n-6}\alpha r\right),\end{aligned}$$

where the second-to-last step follows since $1 + \delta = \frac{11-\lambda}{10}$ and the function $\left(\frac{11-x}{10}\right)^{10} x \leq 1$ for all $x \in [0,1]$. The last step follows since α is large enough. Now we note that $\widehat{A}_n^1$ does not intersect

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}\left((1+\delta)^{n-2}\alpha r - (1+\delta)t_n\right) &= \mathcal{B}\left((1+\delta)^{n-2}\alpha r(1-(1+\delta)^4\delta)\right) \\ &\supset \mathcal{B}\left((1+\delta)^{n-6}\alpha r\right) \supset A_n^2.\end{aligned}$$

Since $E_n^{(2)}$ does not happen, and $\xi^2(T_n) \cap \widehat{A}_n^1 = \emptyset$, the passage times inside $\widehat{A}_n^1$ guarantee that $\xi^1(T_n) \supset A_n^1$, concluding the proof. □

Remark A.4. Note that the event F in Proposition 4.1 can be defined as the events that

$$\left\{D(\mathcal{B}(r), \partial^{\mathrm{o}} A_n^2; \zeta^2) > T_n\right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{\sup_{x \in A_n^1} D\left(A_{n-1}^1, x; \zeta^1|_{\widehat{A}_n^1}\right) \leq t_n\right\} \tag{39}$$

hold for all $n = 1, 2, \ldots, N$. Note also that the proof above goes by using the distance between $\mathcal{B}(r)$ and $\partial^{\mathrm{o}} A_n^2$, and the distance between A_{n-1}^1 and A_n^1, and applying the shape theorem. We will need a bit more of flexibility in the application of Proposition 4.1. In particular, we will need to consider the case where ξ^1 have to traverse regions with larger (possibly infinite) passage times while ξ^2 may advance through regions of smaller (possibly zero) passage times. The reason why

Proposition 4.1 will still hold in this case is that these regions will be small in comparison to r. One challenge with this is that we may not be able to guarantee that at step n the process ξ^1 occupies the whole of A_n. But a closer look at the proof shows that this is not actually needed. In fact, the proof only uses that at step n the process ξ^1 occupies the whole of $\partial^{\mathrm{i}} A_n$. We will solve this by showing a stronger result, that ξ^1 occupies a set $\tilde{A}_n$ at step n that disconnects $A_n \setminus \partial^{\mathrm{i}} A_n$ from infinity. This will make ξ^1 be closer to A_{n+1} at step n. In order to assure that step n remains measurable inside $\widehat{A}_n$, we will define $\tilde{A}_n$ such that

$$\text{for each } x \in \tilde{A}_n \text{ there exists } y \in A_n \text{ for which } |x-y| \leq \frac{\delta t_n}{2} = \delta \alpha r (1+\delta)^{n+1}. \tag{40}$$

By then showing that the event $\left\{ \sup_{x \in A_n^1} D\left(\tilde{A}_{n-1}^1, x; \zeta^1|_{\widehat{A}_n^1} \right) > t_n \right\}$ actually implies that ξ^1 occupies $\tilde{A}_n$, will conclude the proof.